Presented to the
LIBRARY *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by

ESTATE OF THE LATE
MARY SINCLAIR

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/christianliterat01newyuoft

THE

MAGAZINE

OF

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

VOL. I.

OCTOBER, 1889, TO MARCH, 1890.

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE CO.
35 BOND STREET,
NEW YORK.

LIBRARY
JUN 29 1966
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

1089027

BR
1
C635
v.1

INDEX TO VOLUME I.

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Agnosticism and Christianity 43, 98, 168, 244, 315, 389
American Board 149
American Board, the Struggle in 152
Baltimore, the Centennial of the Establishment of the Roman Catholic See of 222
Bellamy's Parable, Mr. 164
Bernardines, The 305
Bibliography 263, 326, 405
Bingham Memorial 231
Bodley, J. E. C. 134
Bonar, Horatius, An Hour With 34
Book Concern, The Prehistoric 230
Book Reviews 252, 321, 399
Brother Smiler 236
Brotherhoods 272
Brotherhoods, English Bishops on 40
Brotherhoods of the Poor 129
Bruno, Giordano: His Life and Philosophy 60
Burial of the Dead 124
Cardinals, The College of 225
Catholic Congress, A Word in Defence of the 385
Catholicism and Protestantism 342
Children for Leaders 295
China, Christian Literature in 25
Christ a Poor Man 291
Christ the Bread of Life 295
Christian Union 377
Church Fathers, The Value of the Study of the 302
Church Property, Mortgaging 236
Church Property, Should, be Taxed? 265
Church-Work, Every-Day 86
Church, What do we go to, for? 378
Churchmanship and Church Unity, American 293
Closing up Accounts 299
Coke, Thomas 381
Congregation, That Evening 162
Correspondence University 243
Creed, The Origin and the Use of the 41
Deaconesses in America 32
Degrees, Honorary (?) 90
Deluge, The—Biblical and Geological 213
Dervishes, The Howling 78
Discouraging Brother, The 296
Distinction, A Forgotten 292
Döllinger, Dr. von 367
Episcopal Convention, The Results of the 148
Failure, The 80
Faith Cure, Curing the 298
Finding a Field 376
Funerals, Reforms in 374
German Reformed and the Congregationalists 88
Gibbons, The Pastoral Letter of the Cardinal Archbishop. 72
Gladstone, An Interview with Mr. 376
Gladstone on Bible Study 91
Golden Rule Legend 298

PAGE
Goodly Words 101, 180, 250
Guthrie's Power in Preaching 373
Heresy, the Popularity of 85
How to reach the Masses 30
Howard Centenary, The 306
Hyacinthe, Father, Why his Work has proved a failure 81
Ignorance, Self-Complacent 234
India's Critical Period 233
Italy, The Contest in 35
Japan, The Mission (of the Universalists) to 232
John Chinaman 155
Lepers, Mission Work among the 16
Lightfoot, Testimonials to the Late Bishop 287
Lightfoot, Bishop 360
Lincoln's Case, Decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Bishop of 166
Literary Department 103, 182, 252, 321, 399
Liturgic Service, The Congregationalist Movement for 35
Log Cabin College of the Old North State, The 87
Logos, The Dispensation of the. 185
Magazines 103, 182, 262, 328 407
Meeting-House, The Old 387
Missionaries, Cheap 93
Missionaries, Cheap, and Mission Education (Reply) 116
Monasteries in England Under Henry VIII, Assault on the 188
Monasticism, English, in the Sixteenth Century 353
Mormon Question, The 228
Mystic, An Eighteenth Century 276
New Testament Canon, Recent German Views on the 92
Nicene Creed and the "Filioque," The 161
Old Testament, Current Flings at the 378
Orthodoxy Dead Again 84
Paine's, Tom, Bible 154
Papacy, The 1
Paragraphic 48, 102, 181, 251, 314, 388
Pastoral Visiting 238
Patton's, President, Tremendous Paper. 378
Plagiarism 229
Prayer, Book of Common, The History of 329
Prayer-meetings, Sick 158
Prayer, Time Spent in 235
Preachers, Why some Fail 299
Preaching to the Physical Man 83
Presbyterian Church of England, The New Creed of 239
Presbyterian Reformers 383
Probation after Death, President Woolsey and 22
Puritans, The Spirit of 300
Redemption after Death 105
Revision of the Westminster Confession, The 27
Revision of the Westminster Confession, The Proposal for the 38
Revision of the Presbyterian Confession, The 39
Revision, Dr. Shedd on 74

PAGE
Revision of the Confession of Faith 153
Revision 157
Revision of the Westminster Confession, The 202
Roman Catholicism in America 134
Romanism and Secularism 73
Russia, Stamping out Protestantism in 206
" Sense, Science or Salvation," Without 36
Servetus, The True Story of 23
Shedd, Dr., on Revision 74
Sin, The Growth of Unchecked 385
Storrs, A Letter from President 308
Superintendent's Work, The 159
Sweden, The Baptist Work in 19
Syrian Life, Two Aspects of 381
Virgin Mother, The 301
Weak Point in a Great Work 296
" Whither ?" 163
Women among the Early Christians, The Position of 49

AUTHORS.

PAGE
Bacon, Leonard Woolsey 385
Badley, B. H 233
Bjerregaard, C. H. A 101, 180, 250, 320
Briggs, C. A .... Art. 105, Review, 257, 399
Brooks, Phillips 291
Buckham, James 83
Carpenter, William Boyd, Bishop of Ripon 272
Champney, J. B 387
Cheever, George B 373
Coats, Professor A. S 292
Cuyler, Theodore L 158
Dawson, J. William 213
Day, Henry 71
Decoppet, A 81
Donaldson, J 49
Dowden, Edward 276
Farrar, Archdeacon F. W 129, 360
Fernald, J. C 159
Gibbons, Cardinal 72
Gillett, C. R 254, 255, 259, 323, 401
Gilmore, George W. 403
Gould, Sarah 87
Graves, J B 229
Griffis, William Elliot 88
Hall, John G 154
Happel, Julius 124
Harkins, F. W 243
Henry, B. C 25
Hinsdale, B. A 41
Holding, Elizabeth E. 32
Huntington, William R .... Art. 329
Huxley, Thomas H 46, 98, 168, 214, 389
Jackson, Samuel Macauley 321
King, Henry M 164
PAGE
Leavitt, John McDowell 295
McCosh, James 157
Magee, W. C., Bishop of Peterborough 318, 389
March, Daniel 155
Merrill, Selah 401
Miller, Principal 116
Moore, George F 322
Nichols, Clifton M 236
Nordell, P. A 19
Perry, William Stevens 222
Peters, John P 78
Plumptre, C. E 60
Potwin, Thomas S 92
Purves, George T 302
Richard, J. W 23, 322
Rothe, Richard 342
Schaff, Philip 202
Schauffler, A. F 261
Shedd, W. G. T 27
Shindler, R 306
Smith, H. Porter 34
Starbuck, C. C 121, 188
Storrs, R. S 308
Taylor, William M .... Art. 185
Titsworth, Judson 238
Townsend, Meredith 93
Vedder, Henry C .... Art. 265, Review 325
Vincent, Marvin R 252
Wace, Henry 43, 178, 244, 315
Ward, Julius H 324
Welch, Ransom Bethune 323
Woodbridge, S. M 400
Wright, Charles H. H 206

THE PAPACY:

A REVELATION AND A PROPHECY.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), August, 1889.

On the centenary of the fall of the Bastile the Parisian mob looted the Café Imolfi, in the Rue Royale. The proprietor had omitted to decorate his premises, a pleasant resort, famous for its ices, and, being angrily ordered to display some bunting, unluckily so far forgot himself as to hoist the Italian flag. "The red fool fury of the Seine" blazed up instantly. In the twinkling of an eye the café and its contents were flung into the gutter, and its unlucky proprietor fled for his life to the protection of the police. It was a significant little incident, noted largely throughout Europe, but in no place more curiously than in the Eternal City, where at any moment the pent-up forces which demolished the Café Imolfi might break out into fierce collision and result in catastrophe. But in Rome the balance of force in the opposing elements is reversed. The Quirinal, which flaunts the Italian national flag before the gates of the Vatican, represents the material force of a united nation,while the Pope in his palace-prison is as powerless as was the café proprietor of the Rue Royale when the mob kicked his furniture into the street. Should a collision come, his only thought must be of flight. If the Pope could have asserted his authority by the arm of the flesh, he would have done so, in order to avert—or, if that were impossible, to avenge—the ceremony in honor of Giordano Bruno, which had taken place six weeks before. No incident of late years has so deeply wounded the sentiments of the rulers of the Church as the unveiling of the Bruno monument on June 9th. The Inquisition had burned Brun in 1600, and, although the Church might have ignored the tribute paid to his memory, that was not the spirit in which the Bruno celebration was treated by the Vatican. The Pentecostal Festival was clouded by a gloom that could be felt. The whole Church was invited to share in the indignation with which its head regarded the sacrilege of the commemoration, and in every way the Pope made all men understand that the iron had entered into his soul. He spent the whole day in his private chapel, prostrate before the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the altar, praying in the midst of the assembled prelates of his Court for an expiation of the blasphemies of Campo di Fiore. From Saturday till Wednesday morning no one was allowed to enter the Vatican but the ambassadors of foreign Powers accredited to the Holy See. It was to him as if the Abomination of Desolation had been set up in the Holy of Holies, and the unveiling of a statue to the heresiarch was proclaimed to be the outward and visible sign of the determination of the triumphant Revolution to press forward to the "overthrow of the sacred authority of the Pontiffs and the extirpation of the Christian faith."

The Sacred College of Cardinals was summoned to a most secret and extraordinary Consistory, in a form and under precautions which had only twice been adopted in the long reign of Pius IX. At this Consistory Leo XIII. communicated to his Cardinals the grave decision at which he had arrived. The solemn Allocution which he addressed to them, and which was subsequently published to the world, amounted practically to a Pontifical declaration that Rome was no longer a safe or tenable residence for the successor of St. Peter. The freedom of the Apostolic functions and the dignity of the Pontifical office, already impaired from of old by the usurpation of the Revolution, were now menaced with extinction by the growing insolence of the sects of evil. The daring of desperate men, unchained to every crime, driven on by the fierceness of lawless desires, could no longer be restrained; the city that was once the safe and inviolable seat of the Holy See was now the capital of a new impiety, where absurd and impudent worship was paid to human reason. "Hereby is rendered evident in what condition is placed the Supreme Head of the Church, the Pastor and the Teacher of the Catholic world." The other communications addressed by the Pope to the Princes of the Church at this most secret Consistory have not yet been divulged; but it is believed that the Pope was able to report a most important and reassuring statement as to the support which was assured to the Holy See in case that any further encroachment of a serious nature

---

Note.—The above article is reprinted in full. It has excited great interest and provoked much discussion.—Ed.

was made on the liberties of the Church. The Pope had received by special courier from Vienna a long autograph letter from the Emperor-King Francis Joseph, in which Innsbruck or Boozen was offered him as a residence—an offer previously made to Pius IX.—in case he was forced to leave Rome. The Emperor further assured the Pope that if the Italian Government were to proceed to lay a violent hand either upon the Vatican, the Lateran, or Castel Gondolfo, or any part of these three palaces secured to the Holy See by the Law of Guarantees, Austria would regard it as a *casus belli*—the Triple Alliance notwithstanding.

Whatever consolation these assurances may have given to the Cardinals, must have been damped by the announcement that the new Penal Code, which empowers the Courts to consign to prison any priest whose discourses are objected to by the civil authorities, had received the Royal Assent that very day. The struggle between the Church and the State, it was recognized, had entered upon a new and probably a decisive campaign, and the Pope, as generalissimo of the forces of the Church, began by preparing for what may at any moment become an inevitable retreat. It is understood that should war break out between France and Italy, or should the quarrel between the Quirinal with its Penal Code and the Vatican with its clergy result in open conflict, the Pope will leave Rome and seek refuge on the Balearic Islands. From that retreat, sheltered by the Spanish flag and secured from interference by the fleets of Europe, the Holy Father will carry on the government of the Church until such time as the restoration of peace shall enable him to return to re-establish the sovereignty of the Holy See in the city of the Cæsars.

II.

In Europe there are at this moment but three men who stand out above their fellows as the supreme representatives of various kinds of power. Alexander III. represents the authority of material force; Prince Bismarck the might of scientific organization; and Leo XIII. the strength of the Catholic world. Of the three the Pope is the most interesting and the most autocratic. His empire is vaster than that of the Russian Czar, and before his authority even the imperious Chancellor has been compelled to bow. Although a prisoner in his own palace, he is ruler of a dominion as wide as the world, and there is no language spoken among men wherein his word is not recognized as the voice of a master. There is a loneliness and a mystery about Leo that differentiates him from the other potentates of our day. Prince Bismarck is intensely human. He stands before us as the very incarnation of masterful man. He lives before us, complete in all human relations, with his wife, his sister, his sons, his dogs, his pipe, and his beer; he touches the common life of his day at every point. It is the same with the Czar: although in his case he is more withdrawn from the public gaze, he shares not less fully the ordinary life of the ordinary man. As father, as husband, as master, as friend, he is a man among men; nor does the burden of empire separate him from the simple family joys and natural every-day cares of the human home. But the Pope stands apart. He sleeps as other men, and eats as they, but a great gulf yawns between him and other mortals. He has a palace, but he is without a home. He has servants and domestic friends; but the celibacy which for centuries has been imposed upon the clergy of his Church debars him from the deepest and most human of all relationships. He has never known the joys nor suffered the sorrows which make up a great part of the higher life of the ordinary man. He has lived and lives apart, alone, divorced from nature that he may be consecrated to the service of his Church, without wife or child, that he may care solely for the Bride of the Lamb, and watch more sedulously over the welfare of those who are of the household of faith.

The Pope, thus excluded from the healthy human life of the family, clings all the more passionately to the local surroundings which serve him as a substitute for home. His centre is not a home. It is Rome. The result is that the disadvantages which celibacy was established to avert, reappear in another shape. He that is married careth for the things that are of the world—how he may please his wife; whereas he that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. For the world and the wife, read Rome and its sovereignty, and it is equally true of the Popes. The local anxieties, the temporal government of the city in which the Popes succeeded the Cæsars, have become as cramping and crippling to the successors of St. Peter as the household cares that might have encompassed them had they all imitated the Fisherman, who had not only a wife, but a mother-in-law. It is this which gives such strange interest to the position of Leo XIII. at the present moment. He is distracted between conflicting ideals—exactly as a good father of a family is often torn asunder between the claims of his household and the claims of the world at large. The struggle which is going on in the Vatican is but the latest phase of the conflict which the apostle declared troubled the married man who had to reconcile the desire to please the Lord and to please his wife.

As some men never have any divine call that leads them to discharge duties outside their own doorstep, so some Popes have never recognized the existence of duties incompatible with their primary fealty to the local interests of the Italian town in which they have spent their lives. That which distinguishes Leo XIII. is that before his mind there has passed a vision of a higher and nobler ideal than that of being the mere temporal master of the Eternal City. He has seen, as it were in a dream, a vision of a wider sovereignty than any which the greatest of his predecessors had ever realized, and before his eyes there has been unfolded a magnificent conception of a really universal Church, as "lofty as the love of God, and wide as are the wants of men." But no sooner has he gazed with holy ecstasy on the world-wide dominion which lies almost within his grasp, than he turns with a sigh to the older and smaller ideal of the temporal sovereignty of Rome, which has bounded the horizon of so many of his predecessors, and which presses upon him like the atmosphere of the whole of his waking life. These are the two dreams, the two ideals, hopelessly antagonistic one to the other : but Leo helplessly clings to both.

To those who do not look at the world and its affairs from an out-of-the-way corner of the world from which the tide of Empire has long since ebbed, it is difficult to see how any comparison can be made between the two ideals which haunt the imagination of the Holy Father. It is, to put it vulgarly, all Lombard Street to a China orange in favor of the world-wide ideal. And yet there is to those who have been born and bred under Italian skies a strong and natural fascination about the ideal which centres in the re-establishment of Papal sovereignty in Rome. Rome is a name to conjure with. For more than two thousand years the Seven-hilled City was for weal or for woe more important than any other point in the world's surface. It is the only city which ever conquered a continent. Alike as the seat of the Republic, of the Empire, and of the Popedom of the Middle Ages, Rome was the capital of the world. The broad arrow of Roman Empire is branded deep on the body of our civilization. Our law, our language, our habits, our religion—all have the impress of the Roman mint. The very air of Europe is impregnated with the ozone that streams, as from a perennial fountain, from the history of Rome. There is everything that can fascinate the imagination and stimulate the mind in the traditions that cling round the ruined walls of the Eternal City, nor can the least reverent be unconscious of the awe excited by the sacred shrines which for a thousand years have absorbed the devotion of the world.

"Mother of Arts as once of Arms ; thy hand
Was then our guardian, and is still our Guide.
Parent of our religion !"

To reign in Rome might well rouse the loftiest ambition, and to lose the sovereignty of the Imperial City might rend the heart of the most callous of mortals. That great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth, and below whose feet St. John saw peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues, was, at any time between the days of the Scipios and the era of the Medici, the natural centre of any organization that sought to exercise world-wide dominion. Civilization grew up round the shores of the Mediterranean, that inland sea which was the cradle of the culture of the world. To a devout Catholic, not even the sacred sites which witnessed the passion of our Lord are more sacred than the city where the first martyrs, swathed in pitchy cerements, blazed as torches in the gardens of Nero, and where their descendants founded an empire more splendid than that of Augustus, more beneficent than that of the Antonines. The City of the Catacombs and of the Coliseum, where generation after generation of the most divinely gifted of our race have lavished the utmost resources of their art, their intellect, and their genius, may well seem marked out from of old to be the natural and eternal seat of the Vicegerent of God.

Apart from these considerations, which appeal to all men, the Roman Pontiffs have acquired in the course of ages, by mere force of inveterate habit, an instinct which renders it almost impossible for them to conceive of a Catholic Church which has not Rome as its centre. Use and wont are great deities even in the spiritual realm, and use and wont point to Rome and Rome alone as the centre of the Catholic world. Many a time the Popes have been driven from Rome : sometimes they have voluntarily left it : but sooner or later they have always returned to it. The administration of the most gigantic polity known to man is centralized there. All roads lead to Rome, and from Rome there have issued since Christian civilization began the winged words of power and of life which have knit the Catholic world into one.

It is therefore natural that the Pope should cling to Rome, and should regard even his contemplated retreat to the Balearic Islands as but a temporary flight from a passing storm. Some day the sky will clear, and once more the Vicar of Christ will reoccupy the See of St. Peter. Equally natural is it that, being in Rome, he should wish to be master in his own house. Absolute independence is an indispensable condition for the free exercise of the spiritual power. This independence, according to English ideas, can best be obtained by the abandonment by the spiritual power of all temporal claims, and the recognition by the secular government that it has no authority in the spiritual realm. But this ideal, which can be realized where there is no antagonism between Church and State, is manifestly impossible where, as in Italy, the State is practically a rival Church, quite as determined to persecute as Torquemada or Calvin. Hence to the Pope it seems as part of the ordinance of God that he should dwell in Rome, and, being resident there, that he should reign in the Eternal City as its temporal lord, not because he cares for the sceptre of secular dominion, but because nothing short of sovereignty can, under the circumstances, secure him the freedom necessary for the exercise of his spiritual prerogatives. It is this which dominates the mind of Leo XIII. Waking or sleeping, the idea of restoring the lost temporal dominion of his predecessors never leaves him. It colors the whole texture of his thoughts, it influences his policy, and makes itself felt throughout the whole orbit of Pontifical action.

And here it may be observed in passing that, however absorbing may be the influence of Roman politics on the Holy See, at the present moment, when the restoration of its temporal sovereignty is but a theory or an aspiration, it is nothing to the distraction that would follow if the Pope were to be cursed with the burden of a granted prayer and set up once more on the throne of Rome. If the Italian Government cared to make a great *coup*, it could do so tomorrow by simply handing over to the Pope the sovereignty of the city of Rome. Leo XIII. would find himself hopelessly at a loss to discharge the duties of the position for which he sighs. None of the indispensable instruments of government are ready to his hand. He has neither employés, financiers, police, soldiers, nor any other administrative officials. In less than a week the bad elements that lurk in every great city would have made a revolution, and in a fortnight the Italian troops would be enthusiastically welcomed as the only force by which Rome could be rescued from anarchy and bloodshed.

This, however, by the way. The Pope does not realize the truth, and the re-establishment of his temporal sovereignty is still his first dream, a dream of the dear dead past, hallowed no doubt by innumerable sacred associations, but limited, local, and fatally opposed to the realization of his other dream, which intermittently exercises a very powerful influence over his imagination. This second vision is infinitely more sublime than the restitution of the unimpaired sovereignty of the Papal See over all the ancient patrimony of the Church. Leo has dreamed of being really the Pastor of the world, in fact as well as in name. To be Vicegerent of God, and therefore representative of the Father of all men, is to stand *in loco parentis* to all the human race. The Church, the Lamb's Bride, is the mother of humanity. As head of the Church, he must care with a mother's love for all the children of the family. It matters not that many are orphaned from birth, knowing not of their divine parentage. It is for him to teach them of the Fatherhood of God, and to prove to them by infinite acts of helpful service the reality of the motherhood of the Church. No difference of creed, no blindness of negation, no obstinacy of unbelief, can shut out any human soul from the loving care of the shepherd to whom God has intrusted the guardianship of his flock. Humanity wanders in the wilderness: he will be its guide. The forces of evil abound, making sad havoc of the forlorn children of men: he will stand in the breach and cast the shield of divine grace and of human service over the victims of the Evil One. Men are ignorant: he will teach them. They are groping in the dark: he will lead them into light. Up from the void everywhere rises a despairing cry, Who will show us any good? And from the recesses of the Vatican palace he answers, "I will conduct you into the paths of all peace."

This, of course, or something like this, has ever been the aspiration of all the greater Popes. But Leo differs from his predecessors in being more under the influence of the modern spirit, which has read a more mundane meaning into the words of Christ. It is reported of Anaxagoras that in his old age, having abandoned all interest in the politics of his time, he was reproached for ceasing to care for his country. "Be silent," he replied, "I have the greatest affection for my country," pointing upward as he spoke to the stars. It is in exactly the opposite direction that Leo has moved. No doubt, like all Christians, he would say that he set not his affections on things below, but on things above—that here he had no continuing city, but had a house eternal in the heavens; but that is no longer the note of Christian thought. Rather does he pray with our Lord, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven;" and in his vision of things to come he sees the kingdoms of the earth become the Lord's and his Christ's. It is to establish the City of God in the hearts and the lives of men, not in the future or beyond the grave, but here and now, that he has been called to the Papal throne. Not from any mere lust of power and personal ambition, but with a genuine aspiration to be helpful to mankind, Leo dreams of re-establishing on a wider basis and a surer foundation the spiritual authority of Innocent III. and of Gregory VII. He feels himself called to make the Holy See once more the active and omnipresent embodiment of the conscience of mankind. He is to be the organ through which God speaks, not merely concerning dogmas as to the divine attributes, or in defining differences between orthodox and heretical subtleties, but as the living guide, the lively oracle from which all the races of mankind may derive the same practical and authoritative counsel that the Hebrews obtained from the Urim and the Thummim of their high-priest. Leo would fain be the Moses of the new Exodus of Humanity, their leader through the Wilderness of Sin to the Promised Land, in which all the evils of the existing society will be done away, and all things political and social will have become new.

Leo XIII. is, in short, a Pope who takes himself seriously, who believes in his divine mission, and who is penetrated by the conviction that the Church must address herself practically to the solution of all the pressing problems of life. *Homo sum, nihil humanum a me alienum puto,* takes with him a wider and nobler range. He is not merely a man among men, but representative of the God who hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth; therefore he must interest himself in every department of human life. All this, which may seem to some but as the wildest lunacy, and to others as insufferable arrogance, has indeed a very solid foundation. Whatever may be said against the Catholic Church, it does unquestionably represent an immense moral force. The most bigoted Protestant may therefore rejoice at the prospect of this moral force being directed to practical ends. Hitherto unquestionably the Popes have not lived up to their privileges, and very few of them have even attempted to rise to the level of their opportunities. If Leo XIII. is really about to apply the vast moral force of which he is the official embodiment to the solution of the practical questions of the day, even those who are most sceptical about the supernatural grace on which he bases his claim, may well rejoice that so vast a moral influence is no longer to be wasted on theological peurilities and ecclesiastical trifles.

But, alas! the moment the Pope essays to make a step toward the realization of his world-wide ideal, he seems to be checked and thwarted by his earlier dream! When he would act as the conscience of mankind, he is in danger of being biassed by his aspiration to be an Italian prince. When he attempts to set up a supreme tribunal for the guidance of humanity, the Italian limitations are apt to baffle him, and instead of being cosmopolitan, catholic, and impartial, he is tempted to become Roman, local, and partisan. If he is really to rise to the height of his greater ideal, he will have to make up his mind to sacrifice the smaller. If he would spread his wings over the whole world, he must desist from attempting to creep back into his Roman chrysalis. The new Moses will not make much of a success of his Exodus if he is perpetually struggling to get back to the flesh-pots of Egypt.

III.

The best way to prove how incompatible are the two ideals is to set forth with such exactitude as is possible to those who have access to the best sources of information in Ireland and in Rome, the simple facts of the Persico mission. They illustrate forcibly the difficulties which render it impossible for any one who is first and foremost the Italian occupant of an Italian See adequately to fulfil the responsibilities incumbent upon the Pontiff who would impartially discharge the duties of the keeper of the conscience of man.

The Persico mission originated in the

attempt made by the English Government to enlist the authority of the Holy See on the side of "law and order" in Ireland. A very interesting chapter may some day be written concerning the visits paid by the Irish bishops to Rome before this date, but this need not be dwelt upon now. Suffice it to say that although the Pope was decidedly uneasy, owing to the representations of the English Catholics who through Cardinal Howard and Monsignor Stonor had always easy confidential means of access to his ear, he consoled himself by reflecting upon the assurances of Archbishop Walsh, the proved fidelity of the Irish episcopate, and the fact that Cardinal Manning by no means shared the alarm of the English Catholics. But after the failure of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's well-meant attempt to govern without coercion, by putting "pressure within the law" upon the landlords who refused to make the necessary reductions of rent, a concerted effort was made to secure the services of the Pope as Unionist Emergency Man in Ireland. After a good deal of secret intrigue, upon which it may be necessary hereafter to shed more light than would be at present desirable, very strong pressure was brought to bear upon the Pope. Lord Salisbury had now fairly entered upon this policy of coercion, and the opposition of the Irish priests and bishops was the chief obstacle which baffled his efforts to reach his goal. It was hinted not obscurely that as Job did not serve God for naught, so the English Government would handsomely requite the Holy See for any services it might render in muzzling the Irish priests. It is obvious that any English Government has many opportunities for doing a friendly turn to the Pope. The Empire of Britain stretches over all the continents and its shores are washed by all the seas. No other world dominion confronts the policy of Rome at so many points. Even leaving Ireland apart, the State which includes within its borders the Catholic *habitans* of Quebec, and in whose colonies See after See of the Church has been established within the lifetime of this generation, is a power with which it is important to be on good terms. Ever since the great convulsion of the sixteenth century, the two great world dominions of Rome and of Britain, the Empire of the Confessional and the Empire of the Sea, had confronted each other, either in open hostility or in silent antagonism. It was hinted to Leo XIII. that if he were disposed to do his part, the English Government was willing to abandon the policy of the cold shoulder and enter into more or less intimate diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

It is not surprising that the Pope lent a willing ear to those faithful Catholics who implored him to seize an opportunity so unprecedented for bringing the Holy See into accord with the British Empire by accepting Lord Salisbury's overtures. Nothing seemed more natural to him than that he should endeavor to co-operate with the representatives of law and order. Himself the greatest of all authorities, he sympathized naturally with the authorities of Dublin Castle, and he had, on four previous occasions, made more or less feeble and ineffective efforts to restrain the priesthood in Ireland from participating in a revolutionary agitation, which in his opinion violated the moral law. The Holy Father was somewhat shy, but the bait was tempting. There was no question at first of securing the appointment of a Nuncio at the Court of St. James's, where none had been received for three hundred years, but much less than that would bring him perceptibly nearer to the goal of the temporal power. Mr. Gladstone, who has never purged himself from the offence of being the author of "Vaticanism," was known to be bitterly hostile to establishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Diplomatic relations only exist between temporal governments. Diplomacy is the intercourse of States. The Pope has no temporal authority. The Papal States no longer exist. How then can a representative be accredited to the Vatican without implying the existence of some shadowy temporal sovereignty in the Pope, which cannot coexist with the integrity of the Italian kingdom? So reasoned the Liberal leader, and it was clear nothing could be obtained from him. The bait was all the more tempting because the Pope knew that he could count upon no sympathy in his projects from Cardinal Manning. The Cardinal-Archbishop has never disguised his opinion that the appointment of a Nuncio would be disastrous to the best interests of the Church. The Pope, however, preoccupied in the cherished dream of regaining temporal sovereignty in Rome, held those scruples in light esteem, and after some coyness decided that the opportunity was too good to be lost. It was, however, necessary to proceed with caution. The memory of the smart rebuke given to the Holy See by the doubling of the popular subscription to Mr. Parnell, as soon as it was known that the Pope had condemned it, naturally made the Holy Father chary of courting such another reminder of the fact that the Catholics of Ireland were still of the opinion of O'Connell, who said that while they took their religion from Rome they would as soon take their politics from Stamboul.

The Pope therefore decided to make a cautious move, and one to which no exception could be taken even by the most sensitive Irishman. Perplexed by conflicting representations, and grieved at the exacerbation of feeling consequent upon the introduction of the Coercion Bill, what was more natural than that he should despatch a special mission charged with the duty of personally investigating on the spot the facts of the case? So it was announced, with considerable flourish of trumpets, that Monsignor Persico was appointed as a Special Commissioner for the Holy See, to proceed to Ireland to inquire into and report upon the questions in dispute between the Irish and their rulers. Monsignor Persico was an Italian. He was a Capuchin friar, who held the titular Archbishopric of Damietta, and who had been employed on many delicate diplomatic missions by the Holy See in India, in Portugal, in Canada, and in South Carolina. His career illustrates at once the cosmopolitan nature of the Church, and the immense range of its activities. Excepting the British Empire there is nothing like it in the world. Most of Monsignor Persico's life had been spent under the shadow of the British flag. He had acted as Catholic chaplain to the British troops in India; had founded and directed a Catholic College at Darjeeling, and when the fabric of our Empire was temporarily submerged by the Mutiny, he was imprisoned by the Sepoys in the fortress of Agra. After his release he collected funds in Europe to repair the ruin wrought in Catholic edifices by the Mutiny, after which he became one of the most trusted envoys of the Holy See. Thirty years ago he came to London on a special mission, connected with the interests of the Church, the memory of which is faint and dim. In 1863 he was despatched to America to endeavor to allay the popular excitement that prevailed among the Catholics of South Carolina at the close of the war. He took part in the Council of the Vatican, after which he was sent on a mission to India, where he presided over the establishment of the hierachy. After this little was heard of him outside the Roman world until his selection as Papal Envoy to Ireland in June, 1888.

Monsignor Persico commanded the confidence of the Pope, who selects as his favorites those who have rendered signal service to the Church. He was perfectly at home in English, of which his Holiness does not understand one word. He had performed many diplomatic missions with success. What was more natural than that at this juncture the Pope should despatch him to Ireland to see what could be done? The fact that Monsignor Persico was not fitted personally to command the confidence of the Irish people does not seem to have occurred to the mind of the Pope. Such, however, was unfortunately the fact. There are antipathies of race which no amount of logic or of grace can overcome, and the Irish, from prelate to peasant, did not take kindly to the Italian friar. In personal appearance, the Envoy is not unlike an Italian peasant, somewhat stout, with a straggling gray beard, sly half-shut eyes, and a certain oily suavity which filled the Irish with distrust. "I would not trust him further than I could throw him," said one Irish member; and it is an open secret that at least one Irish Archbishop regarded him from the first with unconcealed distrust. As representative of the Pope, he was everywhere received with enthusiastic demonstrations of respect, but Monsignor Persico did not personally inspire the Irish hierarchy with confidence.

Strict instructions were given to Monsignor Persico to avoid any appearance of being in connivance with the English Government. So scrupulous, indeed, were the wirepullers, that Monsignor Persico was hurried to Dublin without being allowed to make any stay in London. By way of further keeping up the semblance of impartiality, Monsignor Gualdi was attached to the mission as Persico's secretary. Monsignor Gualdi, although an Italian like his chief, had enjoyed the advantage of having worked for many years among the Irish Catholics in London under the eye of Cardinal Manning. He understood Ireland, and was in such notorious sympathy with the popular aspirations that his selection as secretary was regarded as proof positive that the Persico mission was by no means intended to cover the muzzling of the clergy. But the lesson of the double-faced Janus has never been forgotten by the dwellers on the slopes of the Janiculum. Monsignor Gualdi accepted his mission in good faith. To quote his own simple words, spoken in Dublin, immediately after his arrival, he believed that "The Holy Father wants to learn the condition of the country just as if he were seeing it with his own eyes. He wants to do good to Ireland. He wants to be able to speak from facts collected on the spot. He could not, of course, come over himself, and so he sent us." Such, at least, was the honest conviction of this honest priest. When events proved how much he had been misled, and Monsignor Persico found it necessary to disembarass himself of the assistance of a secretary who could not be bent to the service of the English Government, the good priest took it so much to heart that he took to his bed, and died, chiefly, it is asserted in Rome, from a broken heart.

Monsignor Gualdi was from the first not in the confidence of the Italian camarilla from which Monsignor Persico drew his instructions. He thought, for instance, that the Papal Envoy, after making a comprehensive study of the Irish question, would return to Rome and report to the Holy Father. That, however, was not the intention of the Pope. Monsignor Persico's mission was intended to be permanent. He was forbidden to return to Rome even when, like a true Italian, he pined for the blue sky, and fretted himself sick at the horror of wintering in these islands of the Northern Seas. Whether or not it was believed possible to develop the Papal mission into a regular Nunciature is buried in obscurity. What is known is that Monsignor Persico had positive orders to remain. If his health suffered in Ireland, he might be permitted to winter in England or Scotland, but outside of the three kingdoms he was not allowed to move. He might possibly have been here to this day but for the storm occasioned by the Rescript condemning the Plan of Campaign. But this is anticipating.

When Monsignor Persico first went to Ireland he kept up appearances. He went direct to Archbishop Walsh, the eulogist, and possibly, if the truth were known, one of the originators of the Plan of Campaign, and for a time all went well. The Archbishops and bishops were loud in their protestations of confidence in the sympathy of the Holy See for Ireland. But, after a time, a change came over the spirit of their dream. Monsignor Persico began to inspire distrust. He oscillated between the dinner-tables of landlords and the palaces of the bishops. He was on good terms with men engaged in administering an Act which the hierarchy, with almost unanimous voice, had branded as tyrannical and unjust. He certainly took no pains to establish confidential relations with the leaders of the popular party. He saw some of them in their turn, as he saw among others, on the other side, Richard Pigott, at that time flourishing on the money paid by the *Times* for his forgeries. A Papal Envoy sees all men, and it was not surprising that Monsignor Persico, who in America was reputed to be a friend of Patrick Ford of the *Irish World*, should have rubbed shoulders with Richard Pigott of the *Times*.

By and by, when Monsignor Persico went southward to Limerick, suspicion deepened into distrust, and distrust soon developed into a rooted conviction that the sly Italian was playing them false. What he wrote to Rome has never been published. It is a secret of the Vatican. But judging from common rumor, he constructed his reports on the principle of sitting on the fence. The Irish had grievances—but they compromised their cause with violence. The English Government was too severe—but some of the priests were too keen politicians. Home Rule was a just demand with modifications—but the Plan of Campaign involved a breach of contract. All that summer the diplomatic dodgery went on, Monsignor Persico writing letters to the Vatican, and the Irish popular distrust of Persico deepening into detestation. But Monsignor Persico, not content with writing private representations to the Pope, attempted to do a little "pacification" off his own bat. Being in confidential relations with the authorities, they apprised him from time to time when they intended imprisoning a priest. He then communicated with the bishop, who through his vicar-general put the screw upon the priest to induce him to act with the utmost caution and moderation, and above all not to do anything that might bring him under the lash of the Coercion Act. Perhaps nothing could be more natural, but to the Irish mind nothing could be more detestable, than the Italian emissary of the Vicegerent of God making himself the cat's-paw and the go-between of the English oppressors. So the summer passed, and when the winter came, Monsignor Persico drew up his report and repaired to Bournemouth, to await the return of spring, when he was once more to cross the Irish Sea.

IV.

WHILE Monsignor Persico was preparing the ground in Ireland, his allies had not been idle. The Jubilee of her Majesty had afforded an opportunity for an interchange of courtesies between the Vatican and St. James's, which it was determined to exploit to the uttermost. The Pope had sent a special envoy to congratulate the Queen. What more natural and fitting than that her Majesty's Ministers should send a special envoy to the Pope to return his compliments, and to see whether at the same time anything could be done to bring about those closer and more intimate relations upon which the Pope had set his heart? The motive of Persico's mission was pretty well understood at the Foreign Office, and it was deemed advisable that a serious effort should be made to bring matters to a head, and commit the Pope to a policy of repression in Ireland. It was under these circumstances and with such hopes that the mission of the Duke of Norfolk was decided on.

The Duke, who in England is a nonentity, is regarded at Rome with the respect due to a great noble who has preserved, in the midst of temptation, an unshaken loyalty to the Holy See. One Howard sat in the Sacred College, and the ducal head of the family had always been a welcome visitor at the Vatican. In the Councils of the Church, personal piety weighs for more than intellectual capacity, and the deficiencies of the Duke in one direction were more than compensated in another. All things considered, it would probably have been difficult to find a more acceptable go-between than the Duke. His task was comparatively simple. He had to intimate, in more or less guarded phrase, that her Majesty's Ministers were not indisposed to do a little business with the Holy See on the principle of *do ut des*. If the Pope could see his way to use his moral influence to restrain the Irish bishops and clergy within the limits marked out by the English Government, then, perhaps, the English Government might see their way to meet the cherished aspirations of the Holy See for the re-establishment of direct diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the Court of St. James's. The Liberal Government had for some time maintained, at a considerable economy of truth, a sort of unofficial representative at the Vatican in the person of Sir George Errington, and it was difficult to see what insuperable objection there could be to the accrediting of a British envoy on a regular footing. The Duke was further in a position to intimate that, besides the re-establishment of diplomatic relations, something might be done in the shape of a substantial subsidy and Government patronage for Catholic education in Ireland.

When the Duke of Norfolk arrived in Rome, he found the Pope distracted by conflicting sympathies. Leo XIII. had bestowed upon Ireland and Irish affairs much closer attention than many an English statesman. Some years before he had told Archbishop Croke that he was as good an Irishman as himself, and that he sincerely wished well to his Irish children no one could doubt who ever met him. In conversations with Archbishop Walsh he had completely reassured that astute and somewhat *rusé* prelate as to the genuine sympathy with which he regarded the Irish cause. So notorious were his tendencies, that Cardinal Howard, being asked on one occasion by an Irishwoman whether the Pope would receive her, replied that there was no doubt of it, but that if she would say that she was a Home Ruler his Holiness would receive her with special favor. In this there is nothing surprising. Ireland is to the future of Catholicism what England has been to the Protestant world. Ireland has always been the Isle of the Saints, but few Englishmen understand that in the new world which is springing up around us the Irish are the missionary race. In a remarkable sermon which Bishop Vaughan preached many years ago in Rome, he brought out with extraordinary effect this too often unnoticed feature of the Irish character. But for the Irish the whole English-speaking world beyond the narrow limits of the Catholic caste in Great Britain would be almost exclusively Protestant. It is owing to Ireland—and to Ireland almost alone—that the Holy See is able to establish its bishoprics in every land where the English tongue is spoken, and to encompass the world with churches not reared *in partibus infidelium*, but in the midst of the household of faith. The Irish brogue is as universal as the English language, and wherever there is the brogue there also is the Mass.

In Rome there is the great ecclesiastical department of the Propaganda; but the real Congregation de Propaganda Fide upon which the Catholic Church must depend for maintaining its hold upon the coming time is the Irish race with its cradle and its priest. Leo XIII. must therefore feel intensely interested in the somewhat sombre fortunes of his missionary nation. But as he plaintively told Cardinal McCabe in 1882, "the condition of Ireland gives him more anxiety than comfort." Again and again during his pontificate he has addressed letters to the Irish hierarchy, in which it is easy to discern the uneasiness and uncertainty with which he addresses himself to the solution of this thorny problem. Not even to the successor of St. Peter is vouchsafed that divine illumination whereby the Irish question can be understood. However infallible may be the guidance vouchsafed to the Supreme Pontiff in matters of faith and morals, in dealing with the complex political and social questions involved in the Irish question he is sometimes, like all the rest of us, but as a child groping in the dark. Like less exalted mortals, the Holy Father can only act upon information received, and although he may occasionally be infallibly inspired, he is never infallibly informed. So far as can be judged from the documents contained in "*De Rebus Hiberniæ nuperrima Apostolicæ sedis Acta*," he is ill at ease on the subject. He sees no light. He is dissatisfied with the existing condition of the country, but he had implicit confidence in Mr. Gladstone's Administration. Even when the Irish jails had been crammed with untried prisoners, and Mr. Gladstone was plunging from the Coercion Act of Mr. Forster to the Coercion Act of Sir W. Harcourt, the Pope did not hesitate to express his confidence that the statesmen who preside over the administration of Ireland would give satisfaction to the Irish when they demand what is just. He believed in the justice of those who ruled Ireland, "whose great experience is generally tempered with judgment." Hence he deprecated excited feelings, and exhorted the people to follow none but moderate and just counsels, to obey their bishops, and not to fail in the religious observance of their duty. He is earnestly anxious for the welfare of Ireland, but he adds that it is not lawful to disturb order on account of it. So little did he appreciate the realities of the situation, that, after exhorting the people to give the utmost heed to their bishops, he found himself compelled to launch a circular against the Parnell Testimonial, which was originated by Archbishop Croke and lavishly subscribed to by the people, because of the alacrity with which they followed the Papal advice to pay heed to their bishops. Beyond the issue of more or less ineffective exhortations to moderation, which fell idly upon the ears of men whose own bishops declared, with a far clearer insight into the necessities of the situation, that energetic action was sounder policy, the Pope did not venture upon any more drastic measures than to interdict the younger clergy from taking part in public meetings—an interdict which is practically a dead letter—and to condemn the Parnell Testimonial, with, as we have said, the immediate result of doubling the subscriptions.

So far, then, as the great experiment of restoring the authority of the mediæval Popes had gone, it had not been a signal success, even in the Isle of the Saints, the closest Catholic preserve in the fold of the Church. In no country in the world are the laity as faithful and as zealous as in Ireland. Archbishop Croke was able to prove to the Pope that in his diocese ninety-four per cent of the adult population regularly communicated. Unlike the rest of Western Europe, the democratic movement in Ireland flows in Catholic channels. The bishops are the leaders of the people, the priests the tribunes of their flocks. Yet, the moment the Pope ventured to stray beyond the innocuous region of pious commonplace, he was sharply told that "the paternal mind of the Holy Father, watchful as it ever was for the good of Ireland, had been greatly misled;" and his own bishops in their pastorals did not hesitate to warn him "how easy it would be to persuade a jealous and credulous race like the Irish that the Pope had acted on erroneous, prejudiced, and one-sided information." The Irish are never slow to appeal *de Papa male informato ad melius informandum.* All this was not encouraging. But Leo XIII. is not a man who is easily dismayed, and on the solicitation of the Duke of Norfolk he once more addressed himself to the question whether, as supreme pastor of the faithful, he could not take a more effective share in the guidance and governance of the Irish people.

A very interesting picture might be drawn of the daily life of the Pope in his palace prison at a time when he thus gravely essayed to intervene in the affairs of a distant island, whose troubles have been the despair of British statesmanship for centuries. In some respects it must be admitted that the spectacle is almost ideal. Imagine a pure, good, and able man, of more than threescore years and ten, rising at six o'clock on any given morning, after a sleep as untroubled as a child's, and setting about what is in his own honest conviction the discharge of his duty to God and His Church, by using his influence as the Vicegerent of the Almighty to allay the troubles of Ireland. His authority, to begin with, is almost absolutely untrammelled. When Alexander III. writes he uses M. De Giers as a pen. Cardinal Rampolla is equally the pen of Leo XIII. Around the Papal throne are Cardinals, and Archbishops, and dignitaries of great place; but in all the brilliant throng there is no one who exercises any controlling influence over the detached and lucid intellect of the Pope. Occasionally, earlier in his reign, they would endeavor to bring pressure to bear to induce him to adopt a policy to which he was disinclined.

"What you say," he would reply, "is very good, no doubt, but let it be done in a different way." And done it always was in Leo's way, until at last the Cardinals desisted from making fruitless suggestions. He is so supreme that, compared with the elevation which he occupies, Cardinals count for no more than deacons or even than acolytes. There are mutterings of discontent in the Congregations from men who once counted for something in the Church, but now count for nothing; but on the whole the Sacred College recognizes with loyalty and pride the commanding ability and authoritative confidence of its chief. The Pope therefore has a single mind, and he has an immense sense of his responsibility for the decisions at which he arrives. Every morning, before addressing himself to the direction of the affairs of this planet, he offers the sacrifice of the Mass, and then for *gratiorum actio* attends a second Mass, at which his chaplain is the celebrant. With a mind thus attuned to divine things, the Pope then begins his working day. A single glass of coffee, tea, or milk suffices to break his fast. After going through his papers, he begins to receive about nine. From that hour till one in the afternoon the throng of visitors never slackens. Secretaries, Ambassadors, Cardinals from the Congregation, distinguished strangers, bishops from afar, have audience in turn. There are twelve hundred bishops in the Catholic Church, and with all of them the Pope is in more or less constant personal relations. Nothing can be more gracious, more animated, or more sympathetic than the manner of the Pope. His eye, which when fixed in thought is deep and piercing, beams with kindliness, and the severely rigid lines of his intellectual features relax with the pleasantest of smiles as he talks, using, as the case may be, either French, Latin (which he speaks with great purity and facility), or his own musical native tongue. After four or five hours spent in this way, he returns to his papers and his books until three, when he dines. His meal is frugal: a little soup, two courses of meat with vegetables, and dessert of fruit, with one glass of strong wine, suffice for his wants. After dinner he goes out for a drive or a walk in the gardens of the Vatican. In the evening he resumes his papers, and at night between nine and ten all the Papal household assemble for the Rosary, after which they retire to rest. But long after that hour the Cardinal State Secretary, Rampolla, or the Under-State Secretary, Mocenni, is often summoned to the Papal apartments, where, by the light of the midnight lamp, Leo watches and thinks and prays for the welfare of the Church.

Here, if anywhere on the world's surface, it might be thought, was to be found a tribunal removed far from the distractions of this world, and fully aware of the enormous responsibility which presses with undivided force upon the supreme representative of the Christian conscience. Unfortunately, as the result proves, the tribunal, however ideal in theory, was as faulty in practice as if the successor of the Fisherman, sitting in judgment upon the case of Ireland, had been an actual fisherman of Yarmouth voting on Home Rule without the protection of the Corrupt Practices Act.

When a Pope is to be bribed, the *modus operandi* is more delicate than that practised in English elections by the Man in the Moon. The wirepullers of the Holy See appealed to no sordid motives, which would obviously be out of place in so august a Court. What they did was to use one of the Papal ideals to obscure the other. They nobbled the Vicar of Christ by exciting the expectations of the Italian Prince. No one looking at the sequence of events can doubt that, but for pressure of this sort, the Papal Rescript would never have been issued with such fatal precipitance. But the English Government, represented by the English Catholics, were in a hurry, and the Pope succumbed. Every consideration of duty and of expediency counselled delay. Monsignor Persico, who had been sent to Ireland on a special mission to enable the Holy Father to see things with his own eyes, had not reported. To ordinary mundane intelligence, it seems somewhat absurd to despatch a special commissioner to report upon the facts of a complex situation, and then to proceed to deliver judgment before you have had time to read your commissioner's report. A saving sense of humor would have saved the Pope from such a blunder. But, unfortunately, the very excellence of the motives of the Pope and his own strong sense of his supreme and divine position, seem to make him feel that he may without danger emancipate himself from the conditions which other men impose upon themselves as security against hasty and uninformed judgment. Monsignor Persico had written many letters, even if he had not drafted his final report. The Plan of Campaign had been before the world for more than eighteen months. If the Pope were to render any assistance worth paying for, it must not be delayed. So Leo XIII. set himself to deliver judgment.

It is interesting to note how under such circumstances the Supreme Court of Christendom addresses itself to the consideration of the case before it. The organization of the Holy See is admitted universally to be such a masterpiece of human wisdom, that the faithful may be excused for seeing in it the inspiration of heaven. Unfortunately, in the present instance, its deliberations can hardly be said to be worthy of imitation. To begin with, an Italian, spurred into action by English pressure and English temptation, decides to adjudicate upon one of the most difficult questions concerning the life of a nation, whose existence has been little better than one long martyrdom at the hands of the English. Having so decided, the Pope, who has never been in Ireland, and who is incapable of speaking even one word of the language of the people, whose instincts are those of an authoritative ruler of a centralized organization, the mainstay of Governments and the bulwark of conservatism and order, sends for Cardinal Rampolla, also an Italian, and communicates to him his intention. A Committee is then constituted, composed either exclusively, or all but exclusively, of Italians, who have never been in Ireland and who are entirely out of touch with the solid realities of the situation, and to this Committee the subject is referred for consideration. When this Italian Committee meets in an Italian city, it communicates with the Italians, Simeoni and Jacobini, who are at the head of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, and requests information. From this local branch of the Intelligence Department of the Holy See a mass of documents are got together, reports from bishops and the like, and they are all passed on to the Committee charged with the consideration of the question. That Committee after some more or less general discussion, according to the wont of such bodies, appoints one of its members, who like every one else is an Italian, to draw up a draft report, which after some further discussion is finally approved and sent on to the Pope. The Pope in his turn considers it apart, modifies it here and there, and finally issues it with his supreme authority, for the guidance of the Catholic Irish, who are taught from their infancy to regard him as their supreme and infallible guide in all matters of faith and morals.

That was the fashion in which the Rescript was brought out. It is in this way that the Vicegerent of Eternal Justice exercises his jurisdiction. From first to last there is no indication that one of these foreign priests took the trouble to inform himself at first hand of the facts on which he is called upon to pronounce judgment. During the conception of this extraordinary document, the Holy Father does not appear to have thought it worth while to communicate with his faithful bishops in Ireland, the most conspicuous of whom, Archbishop Walsh, had publicly committed himself to a defence of the Plan of Campaign. The result was what might have been anticipated. The Rescript condemning boycotting and the Plan of Campaign assumed as a postulate the existence of free contract between landlords and tenants in Ireland. Assuming that to exist which did not exist, its censure was nothing more than a shot fired in the air. *Bos locutus est*, and to as little purpose and with as little intelligence as is common to the species. It was a *brutum fulmen* which irritated without overawing, and alarmed without convincing those to whom it was addressed.

In Ireland the Rescript was received with an angry outburst of indignation which found a convenient whipping-boy in the Papal Envoy. Ever since the appearance of that sinister and ill-omened document, Monsignor Persico has been one of the most detested of living men. "And who is that?" said a recent distinguished visitor to Rome, as in the midst of a throng of ecclesiastics he saw a dignitary clad in the brown garb of a Capuchin friar. "Oh," said his cicerone, "that is Monsignor Persico." "The saints preserve us," was the reply; and the speaker, with horror and alarm on his features, crossed himself as diligently as if the shadow of the Evil One had fallen across his path. So vehement was the chorus of denunciation that Monsignor Persico was alarmed for his own safety. Incredible as it may appear to those who know how foreign such a crime is to the Catholic Irish, it is actually the fact that he believed and said that his life was in danger. It was with a feeling of profound relief that he received permission to return to Rome, where he is now looking after the Copts, and discharging the other duties which belong to the Secretariat of the Oriental rites to which he was promoted some months after his return.

Never for many years has there been such a commotion as was excited by the Rescript. The bishops of Ireland, with one exception, omitted to publish it to their flocks. This recalcitrance excited the liveliest displeasure in the Vatican. Monsignor Mocenni, the

Under-State Secretary, an Italian who had much experience of Vienna, but who regards Ireland from the conventional standpoint of ecclesiastical discipline, was scandalized. "They are revolutionaries," he exclaimed; "all revolutionaries—the whole people,—how dare they refuse to publish the Rescript in Ireland?" They did dare, and after a while they were able to convince the Holy Father that they were wiser in their disobedience than he was in his Rescript. The Pope was sincerely alarmed by the storm which he had excited. All Ireland seemed to be up in arms, and the most faithful Catholics were those who took the lead in denouncing the Rescript. To add to the chagrin and disappointment of the well-meaning but injudicious Pope, the only voices raised in approval were those of the habitual enemies of himself and his people, who hardly cared to conceal the note of mockery and exultation with which they hailed the discomfiture of the Irish Catholics. To delight the enemies of the faith and to fill the faithful with confusion and dismay was not exactly the end which the Pope had set before himself when with unwise precipitance he plunged into the Irish bog. Fortunately he was wise enough and bold enough to see his mistake and to endeavor to reverse it. An apologetic explanation was published. All negotiations with the Duke of Norfolk were abruptly broken off. The Duke suddenly returned to England from Italy without having the audience which had been arranged. Monsignor Persico was recalled, and since that date the Holy See has suspended all further attempts to interfere in Irish affairs.

The formula under which this change of policy is concealed is a decision that before any fresh step is taken, the Irish and American bishops, and, if possible, those of Australia also, shall be consulted—a resolution of vast and far-reaching significance which it is satisfactory to have stated on indubitable authority.

V.

The successor of the Fisherman will have learned an invaluable lesson if in future he refuses, being in Italy, to interfere with the man at the helm in Ireland. St. Peter would never have lived to be an apostle and the first Bishop of Rome, if, when the storm arose on the Galilean lake, he had been compelled to steer his craft in obedience to orders shouted to him from men on the shore. At present Monsignor Persico has to bear the brunt of the blame, for the Church never hesitates to sacrifice its instruments in order to protect its head. But in the interests of truth, it is necessary to say quite clearly that it is the Pope and not Monsignor Persico who must bear the blame for the recent peril into which the Church has been plunged in Ireland. Monsignor Persico's lips are closed for the present, and he cannot make any reply to the hurricane of abuse with which he has been overwhelmed. Should the time come when he can be heard in his own defence, the world and the Church will be surprised indeed.

It is therefore all the more incumbent upon those who know the facts as they are known in Rome to do an act of tardy justice to Monsignor Persico, who so far from deserving the censure so freely heaped upon him, may fairly claim to have seen the rock upon which the Holy Father steered, and to have urged him, unfortunately in vain, to adopt an altogether different course to that which he persisted in pursuing.

This is a very grave statement, which is not made without positive knowledge at first hand of the facts. In justice to Monsignor Persico, it should be known in Ireland—

1. That so far from the Rescript having been drawn up in accordance with his recommendations, there were few men in all Ireland more astonished, and it may be added dismayed, than was Monsignor Persico on the receipt of that fateful document. He was not consulted about it while it was in process of elaboration, he did not recommend that it should be issued, and the first intimation which he received that such a momentous step was to be taken was his receipt in common with the Irish bishops of the text of the Rescript.

2. That not only did Monsignor Persico not advise the publication of the Rescript, but in his reports, which he forwarded to the Vatican for the information of the Holy Father, he expressly and urgently deprecated any such precipitance, and implored the Pope to do nothing whatever in Ireland until he had summoned the Archbishops and one bishop from every province in Ireland to Rome, and had gone into all the questions of fact and of principle with those who were most competent to advise.

3. That when the Pope, in his letter of June 24th, 1888, defending his Rescript, told the Irish bishops that his sources of information were trustworthy, and that he could not be justly accused of having given judgment in a case with which he was insufficiently acquainted, because he had sent Monsignor Persico "with the commission to use the greatest diligence in ascertaining

the truth and to make a faithful report to us," he seems to have implied that his Rescript was based upon the report of Monsignor Persico. Although the Pope may have read the earlier letters of his Envoy, the contrast between Monsignor Persico's final advice and the Pope's action seems to indicate that his Relazione had not even been perused by the Pope before he launched the Rescript which created so much heartburning in Ireland.

4. That Monsignor Persico, so far from desiring to make the Church the tool of the English Government, declared throughout that it was fatal to the influence of the Holy See in Ireland that the Pope's action should be in any way suspected to be prompted by England. He had considerable experience in negotiating with Catholic governments, and his conviction was very strong that the expectations of the Pope of gain from diplomatic relations with England were mistaken. They would not strengthen, and they might easily weaken, the authority of the Church. The hierarchy of Ireland, he maintained, were the true and proper channels through whom all communications should take place between the Pope and the Irish people.

These statements are not made without a full sense of the grave responsibility attaching to their publication. They are capable of conclusive demonstration. The Pope has only to ask Cardinal Rampolla to bring him Monsignor Persico's Relazione, to note the date on which that report was read by the Pope, to compare that date with the date of the Rescript, and then to compare the recommendations of Monsignor Persico with the statements made above. It is impossible, of course, for any one else to verify the accuracy of what will no doubt be regarded in Ireland as an astounding and almost incredible revelation, but the appeal may be made without hesitation to Rome. The Pope, the Cardinal State Secretary, and the Archbishop of Damietta know the facts, and they know that they are substantially as herein stated. This being so, is it not about time that a more charitable judgment of Monsignor Persico began to prevail in Ireland?

Much more important, however, than the rehabilitation of the Archbishop of Damietta, is the lesson which this story teaches as to the perils which encompass the Church when the Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar upon earth of our Lord Himself, can thus set at defiance the ordinary rules of statesmanship. It is not enough to have your head in the clouds. You must have your feet firmly planted upon solid facts.

The Pope's ideal of embodying the voice of the Christian conscience is an admirable one; but it requires omniscience for its realization. If he would essay to prescribe for the moral and spiritual ailments of mankind, the first condition is a careful diagnosis of the state of his patient. It does not do to send "a man of tried prudence and discretion" to report upon a case, and then to prescribe without waiting to read his report. No amount of respect due to the holiness of his office, or the excellence of his intentions, can prevent the Pope making grievous mistakes prejudicial to his own authority if he ventures to pronounce judgment upon subjects which he does not fully understand, without taking the advice of those who are on the spot, and whose authority he is always exhorting the faithful to obey.

The root of the difficulty seems to lie in the extent to which the Catholic Church has been Italianized and centralized. If the Pope is to fulfil his greater ideal he will have to shake himself free from the influences of the Vatican. The atmosphere of the place, the traditions and associations which cling to its very walls, and the all-pervading presence of the Italian Cardinals and great officials, render it impossible for him to rise to the height of his great conception of his rôle as the mouthpiece of the conscience of universal Christendom which speaks with the voice of God. Until he has definitely rid himself of the desire to re-establish a temporal authority in a second-rate European city, that minor and earthly ambition will continually obscure his higher and brighter ideal, and lead him into devious courses which will impair his influence even in the Catholic world. Nor is it only in the distraction afforded by the petty anxieties connected with the dream of reviving his sovereignty in the States of the Church that the Italianization of the Holy See works evil. The autocratic associations of the Cæsars still haunt the Imperial city. The idea of centralization is one of the most inveterate of the moral miasmas of Rome. Of course if the Pope could claim special divine revelation affording him infallible guidance both as to the facts and as to the judgment to be pronounced on those facts, there could be no more to be said. But as not even the most extravagant infallibilist ventures to make such a claim, the Pope will find, like other great secular governments, that decentralization is the condition of efficiency and even of existence. Home

Rule is the key to the solution of other problems than those of the British Empire. The Pope, no doubt, will have his uses even when the affairs of each province of the Catholic world are left chiefly to the guidance of the local hierarchy. But the allowance of a larger liberty to the local churches in all matters social and political is the indispensable condition of any intelligent direction of the moral force of Catholicism to the solution of the difficulties and to the satisfaction of the wants of the human race.

All these considerations point in one and the same direction, and they are powerfully reinforced by the most conspicuous political phenomenon of our day. We stand at the dawn of a new epoch which, from the point of view of universal history, is quite as momentous as that in which the Northern tribes broke in upon and destroyed the fabric of the moribund Empire of Rome. It was the supreme merit of the Catholic Church that, amid the crash of the earlier world, it recognized with a sure prevision that the past was gone irrevocably, and that the future lay with the fierce warriors from the fastnesses and forests of the North. It remains to be seen whether the Church will be as quick to discern the salient feature of the great transformation through which the world is passing to-day. It is a revolution vaster and more rapid than that which founded the modern European world on the wreck and ruin of the Roman Empire The world is passing into the hands of the English-speaking races. Already the English tongue is becoming the *lingua franca* of the planet. Already the territories over which the laws are made and justice administered in the language of Shakespeare and of Bacon exceed in wealth, in extent, in the number of their populations, and in the limitless latent possibilities of their development, all other lands ruled by all other nations of the earth. In a hundred years, unless the progress of this marvellous transformation is suddenly checked in some manner as yet inconceivable, the English speakers will outnumber all the men of other tongues in the world. Italian, Spanish, and French will be but local dialects of as little importance, except for literature, as Erse and Welsh. English ideas, English laws, English civilization, are becoming as universal as the English speech. Alone among the races the English have escaped the curse of universal military service. Alone among the nations they have learned to combine liberty and law, and to preserve an empire by the timely concession of local self-government. Whether we welcome or whether we deplore the prospect, the fact is unmistakeable—the future of the world is English.

What, then, is to be the attitude of the Holy See in face of this strange remaking of the world ? Upon the answer to that question depends the future of the Church. If she still aspires to exercise her beneficent dominion over the new and the coming world, she will follow the example of the great Popes who created Europe out of the chaos of barbarian invasion. She will no more seek to restore Papal sovereignty in the capital of Italy, than a thousand years ago she sought to revive the proconsuls of the Empire or to restore the Cæsars. Let the dead past bury its dead. Rome, once the world's centre, is now a mere provincial town, in an out-of-the-way corner of a small inland sea. The headquarters of the Church in the days when she was a living reality, gravitated by a natural law to the centre of Empire. If she is still to be a living reality, presiding over the development of our civilization and mothering the children of men, then she will be true to the law of her being and establish the seat of her sovereign Pontiff in the centre where sovereignty resides. Rome is of the old world, archaic, moribund, and passing away. The centre, the capital, and the mother city of the new world which Catholicism must conquer or perish, is not to be found on the banks of the Tiber, but on the Thames.

Nor is it only on political, geographical, and ethnological grounds that the Papacy must be Occidentalized—Anglicized or Americanized. The whole lesson of the Persico incident, and of many another incident like it, is that the more sedulously the Pope endeavors to fulfil his high mission, the more necessary is it that he should avail himself of those plain and simple principles of common sense applied to the art of government which are the pre-eminent endowment of the English-speaking world. These principles are those of liberty and local self-government. They will never get a fair chance of being worked into the bones and marrow of the Catholic Church until we have a Pope who thinks English.

So clearly does this appear that after long and careful survey of the situation at Rome and throughout the world, it does not seem presumptuous to conclude this paper with a prophecy. It may be that the Church of Rome has played her part in the affairs of men and that in the new English-speaking era, on the threshold of which mankind is standing, there may be no more than a niche in a Roman museum for the successor of Hildebrand. In that case, whether the Pope stays in Rome or goes to Seville or Innsbruck or Minorca does not much matter. But, if there be any real substance of truth in the Pope's belief that the Catholic Church is the chosen instrument whereby Infinite Wisdom inspired by Eternal Love works out the salvation of the world, then as certainly as it was necessary for a persecution to arise to scatter the first Christians from Jerusalem so that they might carry the seed of the faith over the Roman world, not less certainly shall we see in a few years, or even it may be a few months, the breaking of a storm which will compel the Pope to fly from the Eternal City—never to return. And in that hour when those who hate the Church fill the air with insult and exultation, and when those who love her more in her accidents than in her essence are abased to the dust with humiliation and shame, then to the eye of faith the enforced hegira of the Pope from the Latin to the English world will be regarded as the supreme affirmation of the providential mission of the Church—a new divine commission for her to undertake on a wider basis the great task of rebuilding the City of God.

MISSION WORK AMONG THE LEPERS.

From *The New York Observer.*

The investigation of the facts in the case leads to the conclusion that some very serious misrepresentations have been made by the admirers of the late Father Damien in their eulogies on that truly noble man. It is so seldom that any thoroughly consecrated worker receives his due meed of praise, that but for injustice to others it might be well enough to allow the statements made about his work to remain uncontradicted. In the interests of truth and justice this cannot be. The statements concerning Father Damien require very serious modification. A plain exposure of the absurdity of some of the claims urged on behalf of this priest is made by the Honolulu *Friend.* That journal regards as undoubted the evidence that Father Damien "gave himself with unreserved self-sacrifice to promote the well-being of the lepers at the Molokai settlement, and that in this service he contracted the malady as he expected to do." Again, it is cheerfully admitted that "he appears to have been genuinely compassionate and humane, untiring in labor and never sparing himself." But far more than all this has been claimed for him. The leper settlement, which he made the field of his self-sacrificing labors, is represented as having been "abandoned to disorder and neglect" until his arrival in 1874 secured amelioration. This on the authority of Auther Ballantyne, in a contribution to *Longman's Magazine.* To this article, it appears, must be attributed a large proportion of the exaggerated statements made by other journals. Thus we find the New York *Tribune,* for instance, saying: "The brutal indifference of the Hawaiian Government had thrust these poor creatures away upon a barren peninsula. . . . Damien found them a colony of men and women forgetting God and hating men, utterly wretched in body and mind, and abandoned in their desperation to every form of wickedness. . . . His labors transformed this nest of disease-stricken savages into a Christian community."

One of our religious contemporaries in New York makes these statements: "Thirteen years ago these villages were the homes of indescribable misery. The Government had adopted the theory that the lepers could sustain themselves. . . . The miserable huts, huddled together, filled with wretchedness and debauchery, which greeted him as he landed in 1873, have now been supplanted (through his efforts) by groups of neat cottages. Father Damien took up first the question of sufficient food, and as a result of his importunities the Hawaiian Government arranged that food supplies should be sent at regular intervals to the island.. . .Through his representations and under his personal direction, the Government has comfortably housed the colony, Father Damien himself having built many of the houses."

OFFICIAL ACCOUNTS.

The erroneousness of these assertions as to the miseries of Molokai before the days of Damien is manifest when we read what the Biennial Report of the Board of Health, addressed to the Hawaiian Legislature, and dated April 1st, 1874, has to say on the subject. We quote the *Friend :* "This report is signed by Hon. H. A. Widemann, then President of the Board of Health, a gentleman of high standing, a Catholic, a vigorous critic of administrative faults, and his party having just come into office, quite at liberty to denounce any neglect of the late Protestant Minister of Interior, E. O. Hall. Mr. Widemann asserts that 'in material point of view these people are better off on Molokai than most people of these islands, and also better off, with few exceptions, than they ever were in their own homes' A 'large number of *kuleanas,* with numerous good houses' had recently been purchased to meet the wants of the increasing population. (Kuleanas are small private pieces of land.) Six thousand feet of water pipe had been laid. 'Mr. W. P. Ragsdale, who some months ago gave a remarkable example of self-sacrifice in going of his own accord to Molokai, is the present superintendent of the asylum. A more active and efficient man could hardly be found.' The lepers 'have been made in all respects as comfortable as possible.' All this was before Damien had gone to the settlement."

Two years previous to that (1872) the report of Dr. F. W. Hutchinson says: "The food ration is a large one, and exceeds that supplied to the soldiers of the best supplied European and American armies. . . . The Board can fairly assert that these people are better supplied than they ever were in their own homes. A proof of the assertion may be found in the fact that many of the people living at the landing place at Kalaupapa have been anxious to make themselves lepers . . . We repeat again that these people are well taken care of, and are not unhappy."

The *Friend* continues: "The tone of defence of this report betokens the fact that the treatment of the lepers was then, as always, the subject of jealous scrutiny by the Hawaiian public. . . . This report of 1872 describes the commodious house of the keeper, two hospitals for the sick, and a separate house for those lepers needing special care. There are described 'separate houses built for boys and girls, with a special building for a school-room,' the teacher being a leper 'A number of milch cows furnish plenty of milk' for the patients, 'and the food is prepared by a Chinese cook'

"'A little distance from this central place, nearer the seaside, a little church has been built, where every Sunday a native minister, a leper himself, holds a service. . . . It is well attended by the poor people, for whose benefit it was erected.'"

This last testimony of Dr. Hutchinson will have more force with those who remember how entirely out of sympathy he was with the Protestant missionaries.

CALUMNIES DISPROVED.

Our Honolulu contemporary thus proceeds to deal with "the calumnies as to the religious and moral condition of Molokai and the leper settlement at the date of Damien's arrival." Mr. Ballantyne says: "Though the other Hawaiian Islands had abolished idolatry and adopted Christianity, in Molokai—where there was no missionary, no priest—the old paganism, with all its horrible consequences, reigned supreme.' This seems really too absurd for serious notice. Molokai was, in many respects, the most thoroughly and successfully worked missionary field in the group. Mr. and Mrs. Hitchcock were at the head of the work from 1832 to 1857. They were peculiarly devoted and efficient, and had excellent missionaries associated with them. There were no traders in their field, and their influence was less impeded than on the other islands. Nearly every man and woman on the island came to own their powerful moral and spiritual sway. Father Hitchcock was a first-class example of a devoted, hard-working missionary hero, whom the people both loved and feared, and we had plenty more like him. About the time of his death the count showed an excess of births over deaths on Molokai. This was the one solitary instance of the kind in this kingdom. It evinced the superior moral condition of that island. After this, for eleven years, Rev. A. O. Forbes carried on the work ably and devotedly, periodically visiting and ministering to the lepers after they came there in 1865, organizing the Siloam church, and installing their first pastor.

"A considerable proportion of the lepers were members of Protestant churches, many deacons, and some ministers. Their spiritual wants were well supplied by church and Sabbath schools, and have always been the object of solicitous care from the other churches and the Hawaiian Board. And now comes this Mr. Ballantyne and tells the world that Molokai was a heathen island, which Father Damien Christianized!"

Mr. Ballantyne may have been misled by Catholic Mission statistics, which would have shown Molokai to have been without church or priest of their persuasion. Father

Hitchcock's supremacy left them no foothold. Still we think that good Bishop Maigret would hardly have made return of Molokai as a "Pagan" island, however far from salvation he may have reckoned us Protestants.

Why Bishop Maigret left his Catholic people at Kalawao for so many years destitute of spiritual care, we do not know. So neglected, they became the source of much of the moral disorder that existed at Kalaupapa among the idle lepers in spite of church and magistrate. Father Damien did a worthy and noble thing to volunteer in 1873 to serve them. He did a great good by bringing the neglected Catholic minority under spiritual direction and control. He also worked zealously for their bodily needs. In this respect his services may doubtless be regarded as of indispensable value. We don't know of any evidence that Damien's usefulness for some years extended beyond what he did for the Catholic minority. All good missionaries, as a rule, combine a variety of material labors with spiritual; Damien did the same, and seems to have done his work zealously and faithfully according to his ability.

A correspondent of the San Francisco *Occident* claims that he has often heard the reports of the Siloam church of the leper settlement to the Presbytery of Mani, and has known of three Hawaiian ordained ministers living amongst and laboring for the lepers.

CLAIMS DISPUTED.

It is quite evident that the claim that Father Damien revolutionized and Christianized the leper settlement of Molokai is very wide of the truth. In this connection it is worthy of note that there are facts to show that in his work, good as it was, he received more aid and support from Protestants than from Catholics. Thus a correspondent of the Boston *Watchman* tells us that "The first substantial help to Father Damien was from the Protestants, and last year his work appealed to the heart of an English Church rector, who collected and sent to him more than a thousand pounds sterling, which was in addition to the ordinary aid of the Hawaiian Government." This correspondent adds: "Which now thinkest thou was neighbor to this devoted priest? Let the Church which now canonizes him answer for all those years when it left him to the tender mercies of those not in sympathy with the hierarchy, and let them read what our Lord says of 'building and garnishing the tombs of the prophets.' We may add that when the 'Sisters of St. Francis,' from Syracuse, N. Y., went there to nurse the lepers, it was a Congregational banker of Honolulu who built and furnished the cottages for them to live in, and, so far as we know, the rich Catholics would have left *them* to the same real or imaginary want that Father Damien suffered, without a thought of care for them till they too had died of this horrible disease. When Father Damien, a year ago, wrote to Rev. Hugh Chapman, of England, to thank him for his generous collection, and asked him to mention their further wants to Cardinal Newman, he little thought that the dignitaries of the 'Catholic' Church were too busy tithing the mint, anise, and cumin of rites, ceremonies, and dogmas,. to be concerned much about the miseries and wants of a poor priest in the islands of the Pacific. And so he was left to the care of a Government whose sharpest trials in its early days had come from French priestly intrigue and interference, and to Christian men and women in Hawaii and abroad, who could for the time forget that 'the Church' still persecutes where it has power, and curses those who are taking away that power and compelling it to observe outwardly the amenities which it never willingly shows to those who dispute its arrogant pretensions to supremacy over the hearts and consciences of men."

OTHER HEROES.

It will already have been seen that Father Damien's record of heroism and self-sacrifice is not an isolated one. It should be remembered that for nearly seventy years the Moravian Church has identified itself with similar service. Beginning with occasional visits to Christian Hottentots who had been removed from the Moravian settlements in South Africa to the temporary asylum in the valley of Hemel en Aarde, Moravian missionaries did not neglect the other afflicted inmates. In 1822, the British Government placed the institution in charge of the Moravian Church. "For seven years," says the *Moravian*, the organ in this country of the denomination, "Brother Leitner, for ten years Brother Tietz, for four years Brother Fritsch, for three years Brother Lehman, and their respective wives, devoted themselves to their self-denying and repulsive labors, caring both for the bodily and spiritual needs of the lepers. In 1846 the Government removed the establishment to Robben Island, near the entrance to Table Bay, seven miles from Cape Town, and at the earnest request of the lepers, our missionaries were finally permitted to accompany them. From this time until 1867, when the Colonial Government appointed a chaplain of the English Church, our brethren ministered unto them in spiritual things, Brother Lehman being succeeded by Brother Stolze for four years, and the Brethren Wedeman and Küster, each for eight years, while from 1861 to his being called home to eternal rest, on May 27th, 1866, Brother John Taylor devoted himself to the schools. But when this door of usefulness was closed, another was opened, and that at Jerusalem, in Palestine; and Brother and Sister Tappe, who had been missionaries to the Esquimaux, in Labrador, for thirteen years, arrived at Jerusalem, on May 21st, 1867, and took charge of the work. Long and faithfully they worked, assisted by deaconesses from our Church institutions at Guadenfeld and Niesky, until advancing years and physical infirmity compelled them to retire in May, 1884. Since that time Brother F Müller, who had been Brother Tappe's assistant for a short time, has had full charge of the work. A noteworthy fact in connection with this mission is that which occurred in 1887. An entire breakdown in the health of the nurses and other seemingly adverse circumstances, led the Directing Board of the Church to call for volunteers in this arduous and self-denying service, and the appeal was at once answered by offers from ten German and two English sisters. Three of these volunteers were gratefully selected, and at once started on their errand of mercy, reaching Jerusalem in time to be present at the dedicatory services of the new Leper Home, built in a vineyard on an eminence which commands the highway from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, at a short distance from the city gates. As far as we are informed none of our missionaries ever contracted the dread disease, but none the less heroic is it to bear the heavy cross, which the daily care of lepers in every stage of a loathsome and incurable disease must impose."

MR. BAILEY'S MISSION WORK.

In 1874 Mr. W. C. Bailey, a missionary of the Church of Scotland, in conjunction with several Dublin friends, began work in behalf of the 135,000 lepers of India. The society which he established seeks to operate as an auxiliary to existing missionary agencies. It makes grants for the building of leper asylums, and in many instances provides for the support of lepers, but its principal work is that of furnishing missionaries of the various societies with the means for such special work as they may feel disposed to undertake among the afflicted class. Such work is now carried on at eighteen different points throughout India, in connection with the Church Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, the Church of Scotland Foreign Missionary Committee, the Wesleyan Mission, the Baptist Missionary Society, Gossner's Evangelical Mission, the American Presbyterian Mission, the American Methodist Episcopal Mission, and the American Baptist Missionary Union. In a letter to the *Christian Leader*, of Glasgow, dated July 13th, 1889, Mr. Bailey makes an appeal for a new department of his work—that of rescuing the untainted children of lepers. He says: "We are hoping to open many homes for these little ones if the Lord will. It takes about £50 to build a small home, and £4 supports a child." He quotes the following from a letter from the Rev. J. J. Lucas, of Allahabad: "There is no cure, and very little can be done even to relieve suffering. One of the saddest sights is to see the little children of the lepers playing about all unconscious of the dreadful years coming on them. The parents come to the asylum with the children, as a rule, and it is a hard question to decide what to do with these children."

Father Damien has passed to his reward. He has received a crown whose lustre cannot fade away. All honor to his memory. Not to him alone, however, must our thoughts turn, when we seek to instance cases of heroism and marvellous self-sacrifice, as evidenced by a life devoted to the welfare, social and spiritual, of those terrible unfortunates who bear the loathsome name of lepers.

THE BAPTIST WORK IN SWEDEN.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL, D.D.

From *The Examiner*, New York.

PROVIDENTIALLY I am permitted to spend a few weeks this summer in the suburbs of Stockholm. The city and vicinity are famous for the exquisite charm of the natural scenery. The straits, extending westward toward Lake Maclaren, and eastward toward the Baltic, contain, literally, thousands of islands rising here in graceful slopes, and there almost precipitously from the dark blue depths of the water. But whether large or small, their ruggedness is concealed beneath thick carpets of moss and lichen, and overshadowed by dense growths of birch and pine. The red-tiled roofs of handsome villas contrast sharply with the sombre green of the groves around them. Their presence at almost every available beach proclaims the universal eagerness to escape from the city after the long, dark winters, and to enjoy the fragrance of the country and the warm sunshine that lingers even at midnight in a golden, sleep-dispelling twilight. Notwithstanding this exodus from the city, the churches maintain their usual services, with the exception of the Sunday-school.

Last Monday evening I chanced to be in the city, and was invited to attend the weekly business-meeting of one of our most recently organized churches. It does not possess a house of worship, but meets in a hall seating about two hundred and fifty. The furniture is plain, but included a baptistery. Though the rain had poured down incessantly through the afternoon and evening, there were nearly sixty persons present, all adults, and two thirds of the number males. This seemed a remarkable contrast with American churches, where it is difficult to get a quorum. Here, business meetings are held every week, and are on the average better attended than the prayer-meetings of the church. After half an hour spent in devotional exercises, the business of the evening was transacted. Being then introduced to the pastor, I was by him introduced to his people as a pastor of a sister church in America, to whom all present extended a most cordial welcome by rising. Thanking them for their unexpected kindness, I related in a few words the deep interest American Baptists have always cherished toward their brethren in Sweden, and how we have looked upon the work here as yielding exceptionally large and blessed results. From the churches in America I extended greetings. The pastor, who speaks English, as do almost half the people one meets, thereupon informed me that this congregation was a direct result of means contributed by the Missionary Union, and that for this help, without which such results might not have been attained, they were profoundly grateful to God and to the American churches. By an enthusiastic rising vote, this church, as a child of the American Baptist Missionary Union, extended its greetings to the churches on the other side of the Atlantic, and especially to the one at New London, which I have the joy of serving. The spirit of the meeting was excellent. The business was transacted with the utmost order, promptness, and harmony. In so far as this meeting may be taken as a type of those in other churches, it indicated a deep, personal interest on the part of all the members in the secular and religious affairs of the body, and this may fairly be considered one of the first requisites for extended and permanent success; at least, it is so regarded here.

BAPTIST GROWTH IN SWEDEN.

This church is one of 497 included in the recently published statistics for 1888. During that year twenty-three new churches were organized. Of the entire number, 210 owned houses of worship. There were 521 preachers, some of whom, however, were debarred by circumstances from devoting their whole time to the work of the ministry. The churches included a total membership of 32,305, of whom 2393 had been added by baptism. The Sunday-schools contained 32,767 pupils and 2816 teachers. Contributions for all purposes amounted to 312,311 kronor, or about $83,256. In addition to this amount some $6000 a year are received from the Missionary Union in Boston, a part of which is employed in assisting weak churches to sustain pastors, but the larger part is used in carrying on the work of the Bethel Seminary in Stockholm, which gave instruction last year to twenty-seven young men preparing for the ministry. The significance of these figures lies in the fact that this growth has been attained in a comparatively short time. About forty years ago there was not a Baptist in Sweden. One who had embraced their views abroad, and had returned to his native land, was promptly banished from the country in the delusive hope of nipping the evil in the bud.

THE PRESENT SITUATION.

In relation to the State church the Baptists may be said to enjoy toleration rather than religious liberty. The law still regards them as members of the State church, for whose support they are taxed in the same manner as other citizens. They still rest under many exasperating civil and religious disabilities. There is, however, a rapid growth of a more liberal spirit, so that unprejudiced observers, even among the stanch adherents of the State church, take no pains to conceal the conviction that complete religious liberty and the disestablishment of the Lutheran Church, though not immediately at hand, are ultimately inevitable.

The churches are not distracted by diversity in doctrinal views. The strict denominational practices prevalent in America are rigidly cherished here. A constant struggle has been maintained against the numerous and influential Free Church, which in point of doctrine corresponds very closely with the Andover wing of American Congregationalism, but is marked by a far more enthusiastic religious activity. The Baptists have apparently lost largely, not only among the common people, but among those of social position and wealth, by uncompromising loyalty to their distinguishing principles. There is, for instance, in Stockholm a splendid church edifice, built by the munificence of a Baptist layman, but the church worshipping there, though holding on the whole stricter views than Spurgeon's church in London, is not included in the Stockholm Association, nor reckoned as belonging to the denomination. Some of these losses may possibly have been avoided by a little tact without the surrender of principles. Oil is a better lubricant than sand.

The high degree of spiritual life, of warmth, and of real earnestness, impresses a stranger very favorably. The general interest in Christian work and in the spread of the Gospel is deep and genuine, and compares very favorably with that in America. On the contrary, Christianity stands much higher ethically there than here. A deplorable immorality pervades the masses of the city population. In the remoter country districts domestic habits among the common people are such as to blunt if not to destroy the keen and delicate moral sense characteristic of American society. This low moral tone, confined largely to the masses, intrudes sadly into the life of the Church, since it is largely from the laboring masses that the churches draw their membership, and it is not possible to eradicate from the converts in a moment the conceptions and habits of a lifetime. The work of elevation is slow, because of the absence from the community at large of a cultivated moral sense which denounces vice. Though the churches strive by prompt discipline to keep their garments unspotted by this sin, there is sometimes a disposition to deal too leniently with it. This much, however, may truthfully be said, that, whereas the moral tone of society at large is not improving, there is within the churches a perceptible elevation year by year.

An adequate supply of well-trained and experienced pastors is an immediate and pressing need. The older preachers, who have rendered most praiseworthy services, are men whose large experience, in some measure, compensates for the lack of special intellectual discipline. But these brethren are passing away, new churches are rapidly multiplying, and many of the younger ministers emigrate to America, to supply Swedish churches in the West. The seminary in Stockholm seeks to meet this need as far as lies in its power. But no seminary can supply experience. Young men who pass from a course of study in the brilliant life of the capital to country parishes, where the average culture is far from being as great as among the farmers in America, find it difficult to adjust themselves wisely to existing conditions, and considerable friction results. This state of things is perhaps incidental to the newness and immaturity of the work, and may receive satisfactory adjustment in course of time.

THE OUTLOOK.

Has the Baptist work in Sweden an inherent capacity of self-perpetuation ? Let it be remembered that this work is wholly indigenous. Valuable assistance has been received from America, but only for the purpose of furthering an activity begun and conducted by native agencies. This is evident from the fact that when Wiberg, the first who received pecuniary aid from abroad, returned from America in 1855, there were already several hundred Baptists here. From first to last the results are due, under God, to the labors of native preachers. The Baptist cause is not a tender exotic demanding, like the work among the Burmese or Telugus, the constant supervision of foreign missionaries, but a sturdy growth has struck deep roots into the underlying granite, and that, like the pines on the hill-side, will live and thrive despite northern cold and winter storms.

The membership has been steadily increasing notwithstanding the annual loss by emigration, which last year amounted to 600. The exclusions were 1275, but this is explained partly by strictness of discipline and partly by the fact that no members are dropped here as in America. Loss by purification is a sign of health.

Will the movement here become independent of American aid ? Certainly. Whether it would be expedient to withdraw that aid at once must be determined by the situation. As a rule there is more poverty here than in the United States. Wages are low and the cost of living high. The accessions to the churches have almost wholly come from the laboring classes. Probably not more than five or six men in the denomination are worth over 200,000 kronor ($54,000), and the number who can support their families in comfort is comparatively small. A good domestic servant receives 100 kronor ($27) a year, and a shoemaker from 2.50 to 3.00 kronor a day for twelve hours of work. In America the former obtains from $125 to $200 a year, and the latter from $1.50 to $3 a day for ten hours' work. On comparing the total membership with the contributions it will be seen that the average reaches nearly ten kronor each. I fear that in America, with a more general distribution of wealth, the average is not so high. But in addition to this we should remember that the Baptists here are taxed, at the lowest estimate, 60,000 kronor a year for the support of the State church—two or three times the amount of the aid received from America. Only eight churches raised over 5000 kronor, while 94 were able to raise only 100 kronor, or less. But the Baptists here are growing both in means and in popular consideration, and it may be added that the spirit of benevolence increases in proportion to the means. The Baptists in Stockholm support four or five churches, besides contributing liberally to the weaker country churches, whose pastors usually receive very meagre salaries. What if outside aid were withdrawn? Those who give little or nothing now could not be induced to give more, while those who conscientiously bear heavy burdens would be overburdened. In many directions the work would be seriously crippled, if not temporarily suspended, notably that of the seminary. Many pastors who now, with a trifling assistance from the Missionary Union, manage to live, could not live on the amount raised by their churches, and would be forced to emigrate to America. In other words, in the face of a pressing need of more preachers, the number on the field would be greatly diminished, and the source of supply cut off. The work would not cease, but it would be sadly crippled for a time at least, or until the churches could in some measure adjust themselves to the change. Moreover, the churches in Stockholm are still suffering from a mania in real estate speculation that seized the city a few years ago. Many, poor in the morning, were rich at night, but the collapse of the bubble left a still larger number financially ruined. At the same time an alarming spirit of worldliness crept into the churches; but reverses had a most salutary influence in restoring a higher spirituality. Unquestionably independence and self-support are much more desirable than dependence, however small, and such a desire is freely expressed here, with the hope that it may soon be attained. Yet an entire withdrawal of aid would just now be likely to do more harm than good. Aside from the needs of the seminary, this aid is used with the greatest care, and only for the purpose of helping buckle and strap to meet in the domestic economy of poorly paid country pastors. A gradual diminution, to which the churches could adjust themselves as their means slowly increase, would be preferable. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that American Baptists, to say nothing of the United States at large, receive far more in return from the Swedes who emigrate than we send back in assisting the Baptists here. It is rather the payment of a just debt than benevolence.

In conclusion, it may be fairly said that a careful survey of the situation compels the conviction that the Baptist movement in Sweden continues, in the face of many difficulties and hindrances, to expand along normal lines, and in the direction of solidity, strength, and perpetuity. Much patient, admirable, and heroic work has been done, many sufferings endured, and great sacrifices freely and joyfully made. That there are weak points open to criticism cannot be denied, but the same is true of the denomination in England or America. A long-continued dissension, fruitful of bitterness and strife in the Stockholm Association, and from which deplorable consequences have been feared, is not yet definitely settled. It is to be hoped that wise and kind counsels may prevail, and that the cause of Christ may suffer no permanent injury from a difficulty that appears largely personal. We are assured that the Divine Spirit, who apparently, without human agencies, began his gracious work in Sweden, will, despite human mistakes and frailties, carry it to a glorious consummation.

PRESIDENT WOOLSEY AND PROBATION AFTER DEATH.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston.

We have read, with great interest, a very just characterization of the late Dr. Woolsey, in the August number of the *Andover Review*. It speaks with emphasis of his extraordinary energy of moral feeling, his love of justice, and his horror of insincerity, and intimates that his mind was very full of noble wisdom. The fact that he was chairman of the American company of New Testament revisers would seem to confirm what is surely a very extended impression, that probably he was the highest authority in New Testament Greek whom this country has produced.

Under these circumstances we venture to think that his opinion, carefully written in the autumn of 1884, and communicated to an American clergyman, as to the just interpretation to be put upon 2 Cor. 5 : 10, will be read with interest. The text, as given by the revisers, is :

"For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ ; that each one may receive the things *done* in the body, according to what he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad."

Dr. Woolsey's comment follows :

"I would say, first, that, as far as I can see, '*we*,' if we go back quite a number of verses, refers especially to the apostle himself, while also including others engaged with him in the work of the ministry. But his thought does not exclude others ; as when he says, 'We must all appear,' where I can hardly help thinking that he was including also others to whom the Gospel was preached by him, or others. Hence, he says, 'We must *all* appear'—*i. e.*, those who preach Christ, and those who had been taught Christ.

"This is to be observed in the New Testament, that the doctrine of the general judgment is sometimes applied to those who have had the Gospel preached to them, as well as to others who have not. Christ is the general judge ; but those who have never heard of Christ are not judged according to the same standard of character as those who have had Christ preached to them. Compare Matt. 25 : 37–44.

"But if Christ is judge of quick and dead, he judges according to exact justice. Thus to those in the passage referred to (Matt. 25 : 37), 'When saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee ?' who substantially pleaded that they had never seen Christ, he says, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me.' Those who are not condemned may, in part, consist of such.

"Paul evidently expects to be judged himself for what he has done ; which, by the interpretation given by Christ (in Matthew) would subject him to condemnation, if he had known Christ, and had not loved, and faithfully served him.

"'*May receive the things done in the body according to what he hath done.*' In New Testament and other Greek, the article with a clause often constitutes a sentence, even when an important word is to be supplied. Thus here : Τὰ *διὰ τοῦ σώματος* would mean those things that are by means of the body, and *ὄντα* the participle of the verb 'to be,' being often understood, may be so understood here. Thus we have 'things that come to be, or exist, by means of the body,' or, as we loosely say, are 'in the body.' I am inclined to think, however, that the apostle supplied in thought 'things that are done through the agency of the body.' This appears probable from his adding *πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν*, where the verb 'to do' immediately following allows an ellipsis of the participle of the same : 'that every one may receive'—*i. e.*, may be retributed, 'according to,' etc. Compare Rom. 8 : 13.

"There is no evidence that I know of in the New Testament of a future probation. The only point bearing upon it at all is our Lord's rule of general justice, in Luke 12 : 47,48 : 'Shall be beaten *with many stripes*—*with few stripes*.' But this reveals nothing but a principle.

"I am sorry to see the readiness to receive Universalist doctrines, which rest on no foundation whatever."

THE TRUE STORY OF SERVETUS.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D.

From *The Lutheran Observer*, Philadelphia.

ONE of the most industrious and scholarly pastors, on reading the following statement in Professor Fisher's "History of the Christian Church," p. 327, "Yet he (Calvin) believed that such an attack upon the fundamental truths of religion as Servetus had made should be punished with death—this opinion he shared with Bullinger, Zwingli's successor, and even with the gentlest of the reformers, Melanchthon"—asks : "Is it true that *even* Melanchthon is involved in that deed which has cast such a dark cloud over the character of Calvin?" and requests an answer in the *Observer*.

Michael Servetus was born in Aragon in the year 1509. He studied theology at Strasburg, where he attacked the doctrine of the Trinity. This caused him to be denounced as "a wicked and cursed Spaniard." He then wrote a book entitled "The Errors of the Trinity," 1531. About the year 1537 he had several private discussions with Calvin, whom he challenged to a public disputation, but which he himself avoided. For several years he kept up a correspondence with Calvin, and finally sent him an extract from a work which he was then preparing, entitled "Christianity Restored," and expressed a desire of coming to Geneva. This so enraged Calvin, that on February 13th, 1546, he wrote to Farel: "Servetus lately wrote me, and coupled with his letter a long volume of his delirious fancies, with the Thrasonic boast, that I should see something astonishing and unheard of. He takes it upon him to come hither, if it be agreeable for me. But I am unwilling to pledge my word for his safety, for if he shall come, I shall never permit him to depart alive, provided my authority be of any avail" ("Letters," p. 33). This threat was made seven years before it was carried into execution. The passage shows that Calvin's hostility was based wholly upon considerations of religion, and not upon considerations of politics, as is often alleged; for up to this time Servetus had not been at Geneva, and consequently had taken no part in the political complications which gave Calvin so much trouble. *Calvin deliberately determined to have Servetus put to death because he denied the doctrine of the Trinity and held other "delirious fancies."*

The relations between Calvin and Servetus were then interrupted for several years, for September 1st, 1548, Calvin writes to Viret: "I think I once read to you my answer to Servetus. I was at length disinclined from striving longer with the incurable obstinacy of a heretic; and, indeed, I ought to have followed the advice of Paul. He now attacks you. You will see how long you ought to persist in rebutting his follies. He will twist nothing out of me henceforward" ("Letters," p. 33, note.)

At length, in 1553, Servetus appeared at Geneva, "where he went skulking about. He was forthwith recognized by a certain person and cast into prison. Calvin also, whom he treated very unhandsomely by name in thirty printed letters, held the cause of the Church against him in the Council, in the presence of a great assemblage of the pious. He continued in his impiety. What will come of it I know not. Let us pray the Lord to purge his Church of these ministers." So wrote Beza to Bullinger, August 27th, 1553 (Calvin's "Letters," II., p. 416, note).

On August 20th, 1553, Calvin wrote to Farel: "We have now new business in hand with Servetus. He intended, perhaps, passing through this city, for it is not yet known with what design he came. But after he had been recognized, I thought that he should be detained. My friend Nicolas summoned him on a capital charge, offering himself as security, according to the *lex talionis*. On the following day he adduced against him forty written charges. He at first sought to evade them. Accordingly we were summoned. He impudently reviled me, just as if he regarded me as obnoxious to him. I answered him as he deserved. At length the Senate pronounced all the charges proven. . . . I hope the sentence of death will at least be passed upon him, but I desire that the severity of the punishment may be mitigated" ("Letters," II., p. 417). Thus, true to his threat made seven years before, Calvin caused the arrest of Servetus so soon as he was recognized, appeared as his prosecutor, "answered him as he deserved," and expressed the hope that the Senate would condemn him to death. It is doubtless true that at his trial Servetus did demean himself in a most insolent manner, and indeed sought to enlist Calvin's political enemies, the Libertines, in his favor and defence; yet neither of these things, but Calvin's now seven-years-old determination, caused his arrest and prosecution. Calvin had made up his mind already in 1546 that Servetus should never pass through Geneva alive, "if his authority availed anything." The opportune moment came, and Calvin did not let it pass unimproved. And that the sentence against Servetus gave Calvin great pleasure is shown by a letter which he wrote to Farel October 26th, 1553: "Behold what will give you some gratification. Instead of our epistle, here is a summary which will not occupy long time. The messenger has returned from the Swiss churches. They are unanimous in pronouncing that Servetus has now renewed those impious errors with which Satan formerly disturbed the Church, and that he is a monster not to be borne. . . . He was without doubt condemned. He will be led forth to punishment to-morrow. We endeavored to alter the mode of death, but in vain" ("Letters," II., p. 435). Accordingly, October 27th, 1553, Servetus was burned at the stake. Calvin had sought to have him put to death by the sword.

The "Swiss churches," to which Calvin refers in the above extract, were unanimous in their judgment that the Church ought to be rid of such a pest as Servetus, but *they gave no expression of the nature of the punishment which ought to be inflicted on the accused.*

Commenting on this sad affair, Dr. Jules Bonnet, the compiler of Calvin's letters, says: "The error of Calvin in the death of Servetus was, we may say, altogether that of his age, inasmuch as men of the most conciliating and moderate dispositions—viz., Bucer, Œcolampadius, Melanchthon, and Bullinger, were at one in their approval of the condemnation of the unfortunate Spanish innovator" (Calvin's "Letters," II., p. 436, note).

I do not have in hand the means of verifying this statement in regard to Bucer, Œcolampadius, and Bullinger. But, October 14th, 1554, Melanchthon wrote Calvin as follows: "I have read the writing in which you have clearly refuted the horrid blasphemies of *Servetus*, and I give thanks to the Son of God, who was judge in this contest. Also to you the Church, both now and hereafter, owes and will owe gratitude. I indeed approve your judgment. I affirm also that your magistrates did right, after proper examination, in putting the blasphemer to death" ("Corpus Reformatorum," VIII., p. 362).

We close with the following observations:
1. The burning of Servetus was purely a case of religious persecution. Politics had nothing at all to do with it. This is shown (*a*) by Calvin's letter of February 13th, 1546; (*b*) by the judgments of the "Swiss churches;" (*c*) by the letter of Melanchthon.

2. It is a dark shadow on the fame of Calvin that he carried this purpose in his heart for seven years. But both in his conduct in the premises, and in the approbation of Melanchthon and others, religious persecution was the sad, terrible legacy of the Church in which all these men had been born and educated. They had not yet had time to rid themselves entirely from its baleful influence.

3. Luther was the great apostle of religious freedom. Already in 1525 and in 1529 he counselled forbearance with heretics and opposers of the Gospel, and subsequently declared that if violence was to prevail, then the hangman would be the most learned doctor (De Wette, II., p. 622; III., p. 498).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE IN CHINA.

BY B. C. HENRY.

From *The Evangelist*, New York.

THE fact that the Chinese are a literary people, numbering their scholars by millions, their Bachelors of Arts, or "Elegant Sprouts," as they express it, by hundreds of thousands, and their Masters of Arts, or "Elevated Men," by tens of thousands, has always, and very properly, been cited as a point of special significance and encouragement to the missionary as he offers them the Bible and a Christian literature. Their respect for learning, which makes the literary class the true aristocracy of the land, and their reverence for the written or printed page, which will not permit even a scrap of paper inscribed with their sacred characters to be put to any base use, and leads them to employ thousands of men whose sole work is to go from house to house, from shop to shop, and from street to street, collecting old letters, the scribbled memoranda of clerks, and all the fragments of printed paper that may lie scattered about, and have them carefully burned in little hollow towers erected for the purpose, on which are inscribed the words "Respect the written paper"—show their high and almost superstitious regard for books and learning. This love of letters, this homage paid at the shrine of learning, have without doubt prepared the way and greatly facilitated the spread of Christian books; and in the same line, the production of a Christian literature has been carried forward with an energy and a fruitfulness worthy of the cause—the various publishing societies and printing presses, a thousand or more different publications. Many of the books produced are models of style and monuments of learning, and have received high and well-deserved praise from the best Chinese literary authorities.

With the splended array of Christian books so prepared—the Bible in several forms of the literary or book style, and in a dozen of the principal vernaculars of the Empire, accompanied by a good supply of commentaries on nearly the whole New Testament and parts of the Old—with excellent works on Christian ethics and the practical phases of Christianity, together with some admirable treatises on science from a Christian standpoint, it would seem that the chief and comparatively easy task now is to supply the people with our books, so admirably suited to the purpose, and the conquest of China is sure to follow. But at this point a tremendous barrier is raised in the ultra-conservatism of the people and the hatred of all foreign innovations. This deep-rooted and most unreasonable prejudice against and contempt for the foreigner, and all that pertains to him, is more marked among the literary class than any other. So it happens, in spite of their great respect for learning, and in spite of an ample supply of books in every way suited to remove prejudice and awaken interest in Christian truth, we find it most difficult to secure an impartial hearing for our books. The very men for whom many of them are specially prepared, and who can best understand and appreciate them, refuse to open or read them. If we could only get the scholars to read our books, the battle would be more than half won.

I do not overlook or disparage the fact that there is an increasing spirit of inquiry on the part of many of the most intelligent Chinese. It is, however, chiefly in the line of science and applied mechanics. I refer now to the mass of the literati in their attitude toward Christian books. I once invited a literary graduate, the father of one of our Chinese Christians, to share my boat from a distant city to Canton, hoping that during the week's journey I could lead him to take some interest in the study of our books, especially as I was told he was an indefatigable reader and a diligent student. At favorable times, when our conversation had led up to the subject, I presented him with a book on natural theology, especially adapted to Chinese modes of thought, another upon the evidence of Christianity, and another upon the errors of geomancy, in which he was a devout believer. Each book, in style and subject-matter, was admirably fitted to attract a Chinese scholar. He received them with apparent appreciation, but never read beyond the title-page; and at the journey's end, with a profusion of thanks, returned them to me unopened! His is a typical case. They refuse to be enlightened. With their intense prejudice against foreign things, is often mingled a superstitious fear of some occult influences emanating from the books themselves, which helps to deter them from opening and reading them.

The great problem, then, is how to get the intelligent people to read our books and know what they teach, instead of accepting the gross misrepresentations of their contents put forth and widely disseminated by designing people. Missionaries have racked their brains from year to year over this question, and hail with delight any fresh scheme that promises a fuller hearing for our cause. The interest of the native Church has been aroused, and in the multitude of counsels evoked are some specimens of native wisdom on the subject, which are not merely interesting, but very significant and instructive. They meet the question full in the face, and challenge the fullest investigation of the truth or error of our teaching in a most straightforward and practical manner.

One scheme proposed by a promising young preacher of the London Mission contemplates the establishment of depositories in all the leading literary centres of the Empire, where suitable rooms on the most frequented streets shall be opened, and on the shelves, in attractive form, shall be placed all the leading Christian publications—Bibles, periodicals, works on religion, apologetics, history, science, etc. At each centre a staff agent (all of them earnest, reliable, exemplary Christian men) shall be employed, whose work it shall be to canvass the whole country once in three months. There shall be no preaching in the ordinary sense; nor shall the books be sold. The pith and virtue of the whole scheme is that the books shall simply be loaned without the payment of any fee. As the agent passes through his district, he is to supply all who wish them with books, entering their names and residences in his note-book, and announcing that in three months' time he will appear again with a fresh supply, when the people can return the books already received and obtain another set. There shall be no pecuniary transaction and no formal preaching. The printed messengers shall be quietly sent on their way and allowed to exert their silent influence. The scheme shall be undenominational, and no one shall be permitted to manipulate it for sectarian purposes. The plan has many good points, and the widespread diffusion of Christian truth it contemplates is inspiring; but the question of its practical operation remains unsettled.

Another plan, originating in the same Mission, is now in operation, and promises well as to results. The plan is this: Prizes of considerable value are offered for the best essays on the New Testament and its teachings. The contest is open to all except members of Christian churches. Each contestant as he enters his name is supplied with a New Testament, a Bible Dictionary, and other helps; and, as the result of his own personal study of the Gospel, is required to prepare an essay in the form prescribed, which with the others, at a certain date, will be examined by a competent committee, and the prizes awarded accordingly. A large number have already entered the contest, and the close and systematic study of the Scriptures which it involves cannot fail to awaken a deeper interest in some minds than the mere hope of a pecuniary reward. We are looking with great interest for the results of this attempt to enlist Chinese scholars in the study of Christian truth. In no country is it more true than in China, that we must "become all things to all men, that we may by all means win some."

THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

BY PROF. W. G. T. SHEDD, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Evangelist*, New York.

THE question whether the Westminster Confession shall be revised, has been properly referred to the whole Church represented by the Presbyteries. The common sentiment of the denomination must determine the matter. The expression of opinion during the few months prior to the Presbyterial action is, therefore, of consequence. It is desirable that it should be a full expression of all varieties of views, and as a contribution toward it, we purpose to assign some reasons why the revision of the Confession is not expedient.

1. In the first place, it is inexpedient, because in its existing form as drawn up by the Westminster Assembly it has met, and well met, all the needs of the Church for the past two centuries. The Presbyterian Church in the United States since 1700 has passed through a varied and sometimes difficult experience. The controversies in the beginning between the Old and New Lights, and still more the vehement disputes that resulted in the division of the Church in 1837, have tried the common symbol as severely as it is ever likely to be. But through them all both theological divisions were content with the Confession and Catechisms as they stood, and both alike claimed to be true to them. Neither party demanded a revision on any doctrinal points; and both alike found in them a satisfactory expression of their faith. What is there in the Presbyterian Church of to-day that necessitates any different statement of the doctrine of decrees, of atonement, of regeneration, or of punishment, from that accepted by the Presbyterian Church of 1837 or 1789? Are the statements upon these points any more liable to misconception or misrepresentation by non-Calvinists now than they were fifty or a hundred years ago? Are there any more "weak consciences" requiring softening explanations and relaxing clauses in the Church of to-day than in former periods? And with reference to the allowable differences of theological opinion within the Presbyterian Church, is not a creed that was adopted and defended by Charles Hodge and Albert Barnes sufficiently broad to include all who are really Calvinistic and Presbyterian in belief? What is there, we repeat, in the condition of the Presbyterian Church of to-day that makes the old Confession of the past two hundred years inadequate as a doctrinal Standard? All the past successes and victories of Presbyterianism have been accomplished under it. Success in the past is guarantee for success in the future. Is it not better for the Church to work on the very same old bases, in the very same straight line?

2. Revision is inexpedient, because the reunion of the two divisions of the Church was founded upon the Confession as it now stands. A proposition to unite the two branches of Presbyterianism by first revising the Westminster documents would have failed, because in the revision individual and party preferences would have shown themselves. But when the Standards pure and simple were laid down as the only terms of union, the whole mass of Presbyterians flowed together. It is to be feared that if a revision of the Confession should take place, there will be a dissatisfied portion of the Church who will prefer to remain upon the historic foundation; that the existing harmony will be disturbed; and that the proposed measures for union with other Presbyterian bodies will fall through.

3. Revision is inexpedient, because it will introduce new difficulties. The explanations will need to be explained. The revision that is called for is said by its more conservative advocates not to be an alteration of the doctrine of the Confession, but an explanation only, Now, *good* and *sufficient* explanations of a creed require more space than can be afforded in a concise symbol intended for use in inducting officers and members. Such full and careful explanations have been made all along from the beginning, and the Presbyterian Board of Publication has issued a large and valuable library of them. No one need be in any doubt respecting the meaning of the Confession who will carefully peruse one or more of them. He who is not satisfied with the Westminster doctrine as so explained will not be satisfied with it at all. But if brief explanations are inserted into the Confession itself, their brevity will inevitably expose them to misunderstanding and misconception. Take an illustration. An able minister and divine, whose Calvinism is unimpeachable, suggests that Confession III. 3 shall read, "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained [for their sins] to everlasting death." If the clause in brackets is inserted without further explanation, the article might fairly and naturally be understood to teach that the reason why

God passes by a sinner in the bestowment of regenerating grace is the sinner's sin. But St. Paul expressly says that the sinner's sin is not the cause of his non-election to regeneration. "The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, it was said, the elder shall serve the younger. Esau have I hated" (Rom. 10 : 11–13). The reason for the difference between the elect and non-elect is not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure. "He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. 9 : 18). An explanation like this, without further explanation such as the proposer would undoubtedly make, would not only contradict Scripture, but change the Calvinistic doctrine into the Arminian. The reason for non-election would no longer be secret and sovereign, but known and conditional. All this liability to misconstruction is avoided by the Confession itself as it now stands. For in Confession III. 7, after saying that the "passing by" in the bestowment of regenerating grace is an act of God's sovereign pleasure, "whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth," it then adds that "the *ordaining to dishonor and wrath*" is "for sin." Sin is here represented as the reason for the judicial act of punishing, but not for the sovereign act of not regenerating. The only reason for the latter, our Lord gives in His "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."

Other illustrations might be given of the difficulty of avoiding misconception when a systematic creed is sought to be explained, particularly in its difficult points, by the brief interpolation of words and clauses. The method is too short. More space is required than can be spared. It is better, therefore, to let a carefully constructed and concisely phrased creed like the Westminster stand exactly as it was drawn up by the sixty-nine commissioners, in the five weekly sessions for nearly nine years, and have it explained, qualified, and defended in published treatises, in sermons, and especially in catechetical lectures. Had the ministry been as faithful as it should in years past in catechetical instruction, there would be little difficulty in understanding the Westminster creed. The remedy needed is in this direction, not in that of a revision.

4. Revision is inexpedient, because there is no end to the process. It is like the letting out of water. The doctrine of the divine decrees is the particular one selected by the Presbytery whose request has brought the subject of revision before the General Assembly. But this doctrine runs entirely through the Westminster documents, so that if changes were made merely in Chapter III. of the Confession, this chapter would be wholly out of harmony with the remainder. Effectual calling, regeneration, perserverance of the saints, are all linked in with the divine decree. The most cursory perusal will show that a revision of the Confession on this one subject would amount to an entire recasting of the creed.

5. Revision is inexpedient, because it may abridge the liberty of interpretation now afforded by the Confession. As an example of the variety in explanation admitted by the creed as it now stands, take the statement that "God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the beginning, created or made from nothing the world, and all things therein, in the space of six days." He who holds the patristic view that the days of Genesis were periods, and he who holds the modern opinion that the days were solar, can subscribe to the Westminster statement. But if revised in the interest of either view, the subscriber is shut up to it alone. Another example is found in the statement respecting the guilt of Adam's sin. The advocate of natural union, or of representative union, or of both in combination, can find a foothold, provided only that he holds to the penal nature of the first sin. Another instance is the article concerning "elect infants." As the tenet was formulated by the Assembly, it may mean (*a*) that all infants dying in infancy are elected as a class, some being saved by covenanted mercy, and some by uncovenanted mercy; (*b*) that all infants dying in infancy are elected as a class—all alike, those within the Church and those outside of it, being saved by divine mercy, nothing being said of the covenant; (*c*) that some dying infants are elect, and some non-elect. Probably each of these opinions had its representatives in the Assembly, and hence the indefinite form of the statement. The writer regards the first-mentioned view as best supported by Scripture and the analogy of faith; but there are many who advocate the second view, and perhaps there may be some who hold the third. The liberty of opinion now conceded by the Confession on a subject respecting which the Scripture data are few, would be ill-exchanged for a stricter statement that would admit of but one meaning.

6. Revision is inexpedient, because the Westminster Confession, as it now reads, is a sufficiently broad and liberal creed. We do not say that it is sufficiently broad and liberal for every man and every denomina-

tion; but it is as broad and liberal for a Calvinist as any Calvinist should desire. For whoever professes Calvinism, professes a precise form of doctrine. He expects to keep within definite metes and bounds; he is not one of those religionists who start from no premises, and come to no conclusions, and hold no tenets. The Presbyterian Church is a Calvinistic Church. It will be the beginning of its decline, as it already has been of some Calvinistic denominations, when it begins to swerve from this dogmatic position. It must therefore be distinguished among the Churches for doctrinal consistency, comprehensiveness, and firmness. But inside of the metes and bounds established by divine revelation, and to which it has voluntarily confined itself, it has a liberty that is as large as the kingdom of God. It cannot get outside of that kingdom, and should not desire to. But within it, it is as free to career as a ship in the ocean, as an eagle in the air. Yet the ship cannot sail beyond the ocean, nor the eagle fly beyond the sky. Liberty within the immeasurable bounds and limits of God's truth is the only true liberty. All else is license. The Westminster Confession, exactly as it now reads, has been the creed of as free and enlarged intellects as ever lived on earth. The substance of it was the strong and fertile root of the two freest movements in modern history—that of the Protestant Reformation and that of Republican Government. No Presbyterian should complain that the creed of his Church is narrow and stifling.

And here we notice an objection urged against the Confession relative to the tenet of limited redemption. It is said that it is not sufficiently broad and liberal in announcing the boundless compassion of God toward all men indiscriminately, and in inviting all men without exception to cast themselves upon it. But read and ponder the following statements:

"Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace, the doctrine whereof is to be preached in season and out of season by every minister of the Gospel, as well as that of faith in Christ. It is every man's duty to endeavor to repent of his particular sins, particularly. Every man is bound to make private confession of his sins to God, praying for the pardon thereof, upon which, and the forsaking of them, he shall find mercy. Prayer, with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship, is by God required of all men. Prayer is to be made for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter, but not for the dead. God is to be worshipped everywhere in spirit and in truth, and in secret each one by himself. God in his Word, by a positive moral Commandment, binds all men in all ages. The grace of God is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation in him. The ministry of the Gospel testifies that whosoever believes in Christ shall be saved, and excludes none that will come unto him. God is able to search the heart, hear the requests, pardon the sins, and fulfil the desires of all."

These declarations, scattered broadcast through the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, teach the universality of the Gospel, except no human creature from the offer of it, and exclude no human creature from its benefits. Their consistency with the doctrine of election is assumed, but not explained in the Confession of Faith. And no revision of this by the mere interpolation of a few words or clauses will make the subject any clearer or stop all objections.

7. Revision is inexpedient, because the Westminster Standards already make full provision for those exceptional cases, on account of which revision is claimed by its advocates to be needed. It is said that there are some true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ who cannot adopt all the Westminster statements, who yet should not be, and actually are not excluded from the Presbyterian Church; that there are tender consciences of good men whose scruples are to be respected. But these cases are referred by the Form of Government to the church Session, and power is given to it to receive into membership any person who trusts in the blood of Christ for the remission of sin, although his doctrinal knowledge and belief may be unsatisfactory on some points. He may stumble at predestination, but if with the publican he cries, "God be merciful to me a sinner," he has the root of the matter in him, and is a regenerate child of God. But why should the whole Presbyterian Church revise its entire creed, so as to make it fit these exceptional cases? Why should the mountain go to Mohammed? Why should a genuine but deficient evangelical knowledge and experience be set up as the type of doctrine for the whole denomination? These "babes in Christ" need the education of the full and complete system of truth, and should gradually be led up to it, instead of bringing the system down to their level. There is sometimes a misconception at this point. We have seen it stated that the membership

of the Presbyterian Church is not required or expected to hold the same doctrine with the officers; that the pastor, elders, and deacons must accept the Confession of Faith "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," but that the congregation need not. But this error arises from confounding the toleration of a deficiency with the endorsement of it. Because a church Session tolerates in a particular person who gives evidence of faith in Christ an error respecting foreordination, or even some abstruse point in the Trinity or the incarnation, it does not thereby endorse the error. It does not sanction his opinion on these subjects, but only endures it, in view of his religious experience on the vital points of faith and repentance, and with the hope that his subsequent growth in knowledge will bring him to the final rejection of it. The Presbyterian Church tolerates theatre-going in some of its members—that is to say, it does not discipline them for it. But it does not formally approve of and sanction theatre-going. A proposition to revise the Confession by inserting a clause to this effect, in order to meet the wishes and practice of theatre-going church-members, would be voted down by the Presbyteries.

The position that the officers of a church may have one creed, and the membership another, is untenable. No church could live and thrive upon it. A Trinitarian clergy preaching to an Arian or Socinian membership would preach to unwilling hearers. And although the difference is not so great and so vital, yet a Calvinistic clergy preaching to an Arminian membership, or an Arminian clergy to a Calvinistic membership, would on some points find unsympathetic auditors. Pastor and people, officers and members, must be homogeneous in doctrine, in order to a vigorous church-life. If, therefore, a certain class of members is received into a church, who do not on all points agree with the Church creed, this is not to be understood as giving the members generally a liberty to depart from the Church creed, or to be a reason for revising it.

The case is different with the officers of the church. There is *no exceptional class* in this instance. Neither the Session nor the Presbytery have any authority to dispense with the acceptance of any part of the Confession of Faith, when a pastor, elder, or deacon is inducted into office. There is no toleration of defective views provided for when those who are to teach and rule the Church are put into the ministry. And this for the good reason that ministers and elders are expected to be so well indoctrinated, that they are "apt to teach" and competent to "rule well." Some propose "loose subscription" as a remedy, when candidates of lax or unsettled views present themselves for licensure and ordination. This is demoralizing, and kills all simplicity and godly sincerity. Better a thousand times for a denomination to alter its creed, than to allow its ministry to "palter with words in a double meaning;" than to permit an Arian subscription to the Nicene Symbol, an Arminian subscription to the Westminster Confession, a Calvinistic subscription to the Articles of Wesley, a Restorationist subscription to the doctrine of endless punishment.

For these reasons, it seems to us that the proposed revision of the Westminster Confession is not wise or expedient. The revision of a denominational creed is a rare occurrence in ecclesiastical history. Commonly a denomination remains from first to last upon the base that was laid for it in the beginning by its fathers and founders. And when revision does occur, it is seldom in the direction of fullness and precision. Usually the alteration is in favor of vague and looser statements. Even slight changes are apt to be followed by greater ones. The disposition to revise and alter needs watching. In an age when the general drift of the unregenerate world is away from the strong statements of the Hebrew prophets, of Christ and his inspired Apostles, it is of the utmost importance that the regenerate Church, in all its denominations, should stand firm in the old paths, and hold fast to that "Word of God which is sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit."

HOW TO REACH THE MASSES.

From *Christian Register*, Boston.

Mr. Moody has established a school in Chicago for the training of students for Christian work in the great cities. He has buildings already which cost $100,000, and an endowment of $125,000 in addition. He outlined to a Boston *Herald* reporter his general plan.

"We want," he says, "to reach the men and women in our cities. Three fourths of the people in these large places do not go to church. We must have a different class of men and women from what we have now if we are going to reach these people. Our theological seminaries are training preachers for the intellectual classes of the community, but that training disqualifies them for reaching the mechanics and the other classes who make up most of the population of our large cities. We must have a different class of workers to reach the people from the graduates of our theological seminaries. I do not propose to teach Latin and Greek and Hebrew in this new institution in Chicago, but to give the students a thorough knowledge of the Bible. We want men of business training, men who understand the book of human nature, men who know what the people need and how to reach them. You take a man who has gone to a fitting school for several years, then four years to college, and then three years to a theological seminary, and he comes out with as little knowledge of human nature as if he had dropped out of the moon. Such men, as a class, are not qualified to reach the masses. I am not saying a word against the theological seminaries: they have their place. But the Rebellion would never have been put down by West Point graduates alone. We had to have volunteers. Just so it is here. We cannot do our work with nobody but the graduates of the seminaries. We must have volunteers. I must have the very best teachers that can possibly be found in the whole country. Then, too, such men as I want for students are rare. Now many men are scared from going into the Christian work because they see that it takes them a long time to be ready to begin. A young man doesn't know till he is twenty or twenty-three years old what he wants to do for a profession. But if he waits till then to decide to be a minister, and then goes to college and the seminary, he will be thirty years old by the time he is ready to begin work; and his life is half taken out of him by that time. We want to get at the matter practically, so that working Christians may know what they can do. My idea is to find a short cut to Christian work. Now, a young man, with a good English education, ought to be ready for his work in one or two years. There are two buildings in our institution in Chicago, one for women and one for men; and, with 200 students, it will cost $30,000 a year to keep it up. But we are going to be very cautious about those we take. We do not want students without qualifications for our work. There would be no difficulty in filling up with those who want to come. Plenty of men and women live in the world who have natural gifts for our sort of work, but the trouble is in finding them. They have had training schools for foreign missionaries, and now we propose to train these young men and women for the work they are best fitted for. If they are best fitted for work in the musical service, we shall give them a training in music. If their power lies in visiting the sick, we shall train them for that. If it is in public speaking, then we shall train the student for that. If it is in visitation from house to house, we shall train them for that. Women are better qualified than men for this work. A woman can go to a woman right into her kitchen, and sit down by her wash-tub and give her help. If her children are sick, she can give them medicine or get a doctor for them; and so she can do a great deal of good in time of need. This is a practical work which we want to do, and it will speak louder than volumes of sermons.

"This work must be done, or there will be a revolution. It is reformation or revolution for our country. Things cannot go on as they are. Our republic cannot exist without righteousness. The wave of infidelity which swept over the country five years ago is receding. I do not find as much infidelity now in a month in the questions which are asked by the young men, after a meeting, as I used to find five years ago in one day. Then the young men were full of Ingersollism, and thought Christianity was worn out. But they have found that there is nothing to infidelity. It tears down, but does not build up. It does not give them anything. This is part of the same movement which we see in France. The men there are going back to the churches. Gambetta and those about him had such influence that they swept the men away from the churches. You might have gone there, and seen the churches attended by women and children, but no men. Now, however, the men are coming back. It is a part of the reaction against atheism. Now our cities are filling up with people who are thinking over new ideas, and they must be met. Just now there is a great movement toward Socialism, especially in such places as Chicago. When I was there, the people brought me their Socialist books to read; and I told them that, if I was half as earnest to have them Christians as they were to have me a Socialist, they would soon be converted."

DEACONESSES IN AMERICA.

BY ELIZABETH E. HOLDING.

From *The Christian at Work*, New York.

Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of Chicago witnessed an event recently of considerable significance to that denomination, for on that occasion were consecrated three Deaconesses. The European Deaconess, with her old-fashioned dress and white cap, is a not unfamiliar sight to travellers, but until recently the Order has been an exotic in this country. In 1849 Pastor Fliedner, the renowned founder of the Kaiserwerth community of Deaconesses in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, located two German Deaconesses at Pittsburg, Pa.; and it was confidently hoped that the Order would take root and flourish in this country as it has done in Europe. Unfortunately, such did not prove to be the case. The sisters were joined by three or four more, but probationers volunteered very slowly or not at all, some left the work, and besides caring for the sick in a small hospital in that city, not much has been done.

A more promising effort has been made, however, during this decade in Philadelphia, where a magnificent property has been donated for a "Mother-House of Deaconesses"—that is, a training home for Deaconess-probationers, a home for the active workers and a refuge in sickness and old age. In June, 1884, a little independent colony of Deaconesses was brought over from Prussia to assist in nursing in the German Hospital in that city. Several more have joined them from the "Fatherland," and at present they number eleven full Deaconesses and seventeen probationers, of whom, however, only two are of American birth. Mr. John D. Lankenau, a benevolent and devoted German gentleman, is the patron of this institution, as well as that of the German Hospital and the "Mary J. Drexel Home for the Aged" in Philadelphia. He built and furnished the magnificent building, one spacious wing of which is the "Mother House." He has also most generously endowed the home. Far more interest has attended this movement than followed the almost abortive attempt in Pittsburg; probationers are volunteering, and success seems assured to the work so auspiciously begun. A movement is also on foot among the Swedish Lutherans, several women being in training, and a fine home being in process of construction in Omaha, Neb. The work undertaken by these Deaconesses is at present confined to nursing the sick, but further work in more direct, or at least more common, mission lines is contemplated by the management of the Homes. It is to be regretted that the semi-foreign character of these Homes has prevented their attracting deserved attention from the philanthropic public.

The Episcopal Church has for many years encouraged women to live in communities, under the name of "Sisters" and Deaconesses. At present there are sixteen communities of Sisters in the United States, numbering about 250 Sisters and novitiates. Perhaps the most important of these Sisterhoods is the Community of St. Mary, in New York City, which was founded in 1865, and has at present ninety members, with novitiates. Sisters usually take the "threefold vow of chastity, poverty, and obedience" for life, but only after a period of probation extending from eighteen months to three or even five years. The practical work of the Sisters includes the care of the sick in the hospitals, the management of young ladies' schools, orphanages, refuges, reformatories, etc., a labor of love which commends them to our confidence and admiration. There is, however, an element of monasticism and an almost Romish ritualism in connection with Sisterhoods in general, which has incurred the suspicion of the so-called "broader" element, even in their own denomination. As for Deaconesses, there are but two communities of Deaconesses in the Episcopal Church, according to Canon Street in "The Living Church"—one in Alabama and one in Louisville, Ky.; and the members of these communities at the present time number only twelve—a melancholy contrast to the 250 Sisters—a contrast not explained by the distinction made by Episcopal authorities between a Deaconess and a Sister. Sisters must live in communities, while a Deaconess may or may not. The Sister is under rule "for the express purpose of discipline and formation of character." The Deaconess, though theoretically ranking as a church officer, is really only a parochial assistant. The vow of the Sister is usually for life, that of a Deaconess for a term of years only. In the one case, as in the other, a "vocation," a definite call is considered necessary. But—and here may be a hint as to the reason why Sisterhoods flourish and the Deaconess Communities languish—the Sister says her prayers, with or without beads, ten times a day, more or less. She sometimes goes to confession and does penance. She teaches French and music, painting and needle-work in young ladies' schools, as well as attending to the more serious business of the hospital and reformatory; while the Deaconess is usually only a simple pastor's assistant, too busy to be much of a mystic or monastic.

The evident need of some new agency in dealing with the problems of modern civilization, and the manifest existence of this agency in the number of unemployed or frivolously employed women at the present time, attracts widespread attention and interest to the movement which is being inaugurated under the management of a more evangelistic branch of the Church in America. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, its ultimate legislative body, meeting once in four years, authorized the creation of an Order of Deaconesses in May, 1888, whose duties should be "To minister to the poor, visit the sick, pray with the dying, care for the orphan, seek the wandering, comfort the sorrowing, save the sinning, and relinquishing all other pursuits, to devote themselves in a general way to such forms of Christian labor as may be suited to their abilities." The action of the conference being very indefinite, details have been taken up energetically by interested ministers and laymen in the denomination. The prescribed "two years of continuous service," prescribed by the Church as preliminary to licensing, has been translated to mean two years' careful preparation and training. A course of study has been adopted which covers most of the time of the first year, and the second year is spent in practical work, with a prescribed but rather light course of reading. There are required, examinations, a medical certificate, and a recommendation for the office from a "Quarterly Conference," a subordinate body of officers connected with some local church. The three Deaconesses consecrated in Chicago the other day are the only three in the United States who have passed the required conditions, and these were all graduates of the Chicago Training School for City, Home, and Foreign Missions. The vow of these Deaconesses is not for life, nor indeed for a term of years. The very use of the word "vow" is forbidden in express terms by the General Conference, which by the simplicity of its directions evidently intended to avoid anything like possible Romish abuse of the Order. There was a form of service used at the Consecration, however, in which a Bishop, the candidates, and the audience present had a part—all being supplied with printed copies. In the course of this service, after the preliminaries, which consisted of a historical *resume* of the Order in the early Church and responsive readings between the Bishop and the people, Bishop Thomas Bowman, senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, addressed himself to the three candidates before him, reminding them that the duties to which they were being set apart were the same as those of early Deaconesses in the Church of God. He then asked them the following question: "Are you convinced that God has called you to this ministration in the Church?" to which they all responded: "I am." He then asked them a second and last question: "Do you, in the presence of God and this congregation, determine faithfully to perform the duties pertaining to the office of Deaconess in the Church of God?" They answered: "I do."

The connection of the Chicago Training School with the Deaconess movement is of interest. A year before the meeting of the General Conference in 1888 there was an unauthorized beginning of Deaconess work in connection with it in the city of Chicago.

In June, 1887, among the graduates of the Training School, which, by the way, is not literary but altogether technical in its training, were found eight or ten ladies willing to remain in the city during the summer, and continue the practical missionary work which had formed a part of their training in the school, provided they could be furnished with a home and board only—a basis of work. Partly on the faith plan and partly on the "desperation plan," as one of those taking the responsibility says, the managers of the Training School, Rev. J. S. Meyer and his wife, Lucy Ryder Meyer, determined to become responsible for the board and car-fare of these women; desperation because of the tremendous urgency of the city field during the hot summer months, when the pastors and Sunday-school teachers leave it and flee to the country for a much-needed rest and change. As fall approached it was found that the experiment had been wonderfully successful. Accounts were balanced with a trifle in the treasury. The demand for city mission work was increasing, and not only graduates from the Training School, but others were volunteering for the work, and again on a plan, which was a "mixture of faith and desperation," a house was rented—the Training School building being no longer available, on account of the return of the students—and the first Deaconess Home in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the

United States began its independent existence. It was called a Deaconess Home from the first, and how much this Home had to do with influencing the General Conference action remains a problem—certainly not a little. But for the establishment of this home, and the fact that its members passed the first of the two years of probation ordered by the General Conference, prior to that ordering, the interesting event at Centenary Church must have been delayed a whole year.

There are at present about thirty Deaconess probationers in the four Homes which have been established in Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, and Minneapolis. One of the difficulties attending this movement, as is the case in the German and Swedish work, has been the slowness of women to volunteer for this work, which is not to be wondered at, considering that there is no pecuniary inducement held out to them, as they receive nothing but a plain support, and that the movement as yet lacks the prestige and momentum of a large company and a long history. This, however, is gradually being removed, the number of applicants being larger and better than ever before.

The Presbyterians have taken decided commendatory action concerning the introduction of Deaconesses into their communion, both in the General Council last year and in their recent General Assembly in New York. It can hardly fail that practical steps will soon follow, and that other denominations will not be slow to adopt plans which are proving so successful.

As the knowledge of this work spreads, it will doubtless touch the hearts of many women with empty hands and unsatisfied hearts, as well as the hearts of many whose hands are not empty, and yet whose hearts are not satisfied. And may it not be that by this work of Christian women among the poor, the question of "reaching the masses" will, to a great extent, be solved?

AN HOUR WITH HORATIUS BONAR.

BY H. PORTER SMITH, CAMBRIDGE.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston.

Dr. Bonar tenderly loved children, and wrote sweet hymns for them. How keenly those in Edinburgh will feel his loss! Being in that city a few years ago, it was my good fortune to hear him address an assembly of Sunday-school children, and before he entered the pulpit sing with them some of his children songs. When he went up the long pulpit stairs, the children caught the inspiration of his presence, and sang with new strength and impressiveness. As has been said, his personal appearance and bearing reminded one of his hymns—"tender, sweet, and tranquil."

His long white hair made him look venerable, but he had no other mark of old age. His prayer was simple as a child. His voice was low, quiet, and persuasive. It had a decided Scotch accent, but was clear and pleasing. His whole manner was suggestive of his lines:

> "Calm me, my God, and keep me calm;
> Let thine outstretched wing
> Be like the shade of Elim's palm
> Beside her desert spring."

He leaned over the high pulpit and spoke for nearly an hour, in a quiet manner, yet with a magnetic power that riveted every eye. The children looked steadily in his face. The address fastened itself upon my mind. He read with the children the first part of the third chapter of John. His manner of reading the Scriptures with them was to me novel as well as interesting, though I judge it to be a Scottish custom. He read: "There was a man of the Pharisees named"—here he paused, and the children responded, "Nicodemus." "The same came to Jesus by"—"night," responded the children. So, through the reading, the children read the word at which he paused. The harmony and promptness required, and the fact that they did not know the word at which he would stop, made the strictest attention necessary on their part. Occasionally he would say, very kindly, "Be careful, children."

The reading over, he spoke of the two questions which Nicodemus asked Jesus. The first was one of curiosity: "How can a man be born when he is old?" The second, one of intense personal interest: "How can these things be?" As if he had asked, "How can I be born again?" He then, in a most interesting manner, told the story of the lifting up of the brazen serpent, and portrayed vividly the scene of the suffering Israelites. He described a painting illustrating that scene; where some were turning their backs to the brazen serpent, though sorely bitten, others were employing physicians to heal them, while others were binding up their own wounds, and a few were obeying the command of Moses to look to the only source of help. Then he went on: "Must that old man look? Yes. Must that young man look? Yes. And that young woman? Yes. Must that boy look, and that girl? Yes. Must that mother carrying her poor little smitten boy in her arms, turn his face so that he can look? Yes. How long must they look—a year? No. A month? No. A day? No, not a day. An hour? Not an hour. A minute? I hardly think it. Only just a look, and in a moment they will be healed."

I shall not attempt to tell how he showed to the children that

"There's life for a look at the crucified One."

It needs the tender persuasive tones of that voice now hushed, the large, soft, dark eyes now closed, to give the emphasis. This was a memorable Sabbath evening hour to the three Americans who were present.

This sweet and impressive hymn-writer has joined the heavenly choir. What a welcome he must have! How easy for him to take up the new song; and even his earthly face would not seem out of place in that choir.

"Praise Him above, ye heavenly host,"

we are singing here; and now he is responding there. Where is the Christian heart he has not helped, and to whom has he not endeared himself?

THE CONTEST IN ITALY.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

THE troubles of the two rival powers in Italy, the King and the Pope, are increasing. Each has the faculty of wounding the other, but, like the gods in the Homeric contests—neither can kill nor extinguish. The Pope has formally excommunicated the King and Queen, which they, being devout children of the Church, feel deeply. The landlord of M. Crispi, the Prime Minister, being ecclesiastical—in fact, if we remember rightly, the College of the Propaganda—has turned him out of his pleasant domicile in the palazzo of a cardinal.

On the other hand, the anti-Papal powers have got hold of and published the documents relative to the trial (by torture) of Bruno, and also a concession by Pius IX. of relinquishment of the temporal power made to Austria when there seemed a chance that on no other terms could he get back to Rome. Also the Pope has been notified that he can leave Rome if he likes, but must leave also the treasures of the Vatican. The effect of all these things is to deepen the gulf between the two.

We are sorry to note this, because whatever the errors of Papalism, it is a better religion for Italy than none at all, and because the driving of the nation into infidelity can hardly accomplish that great work of national regeneration which has been so auspiciously begun. But most of all, the hope of a restored Christian unity lies in the reformation of the Roman Church. And this must be, to all human likelihood, accomplished from within; no external forces can reform Latin Christianity, because in its very essence it is impervious to external influence. It recognizes no other voice than one issuing from within its own borders.

All outside it lies a world either heathen or heretic and from that world it will take no suggestions. But a civil power acting in accord with it and professing to be guided by it in matters of faith might do much. We should look only for indirect changes, but these, if accepted by the Papacy, might be harmoniously brought about. What is needed is reconstruction, repair, cleansing and re-edifying, not the wholesale pulling down and casting out which would be the result of a successful battle won by the civil power of Italy.

THE CONGREGATIONALIST MOVEMENT FOR LITURGIC SERVICE.

[From *The Churchman*, New York.

THE Chicago *Advance* has a very well written leader on the subject of the enrichment of public worship in the Congregational body. It says: "The Congregational churches are groping in the dark for a better service. They hardly know what they want; they still less know how to get whatever they may want; but they do know they want something to render the service of worship more vigorous and impressive."

In the further discussion of the subject, the *Advance* says, "the enrichment will be characterized as being biblical." Again, it says, "we have indeed well-nigh worshipped the Bible, putting it on the pulpit and letting it there stay, but we have not adequately used the Bible as a means of worship in the pews."

Of course we do not contradict this confession of the *Advance* in behalf of the denomination it represents But we should hardly like to have said so harsh a thing ourselves, of so respectable a body of our fellow Christians. It is doubtless true in certain instances, because the very nature of extemporized worship will allow the neglect of the Bible if the minister so chooses. There is no power to compel him to do even so much as to take a text for his sermon from its pages, and it is possible for him to restrict his Scripture readings to a very narrow range. The Church Lectionary and the Order of the Christian Year have this advantage, that the individual taste of the minister is not allowed to lessen the pasture into which he leads his people. He may not find the selections edifying, but they do.

But we find suggested in the remarks of the *Advance* one or two points which we think escaped the notice of the writer. The writer, after praising certain books—viz., those of Dr. Green and Mr. Hungerford, very highly, complains that they have met with no general acceptance by the ministry or the churches. This, the *Advance* says, is from their want of flexibility. How flexibility can be wanting in a service where it is perfectly free to each officiating minister to use just as much or just as little as he likes we fail to see. It seems to us that coherence and stability are the points lacking. The essential point in the Prayer Book services is that the people always know what to do, and that when the service is varied, as it often is, in mission services, there is never any awkwardness, because the familiar principles of worship are always observed.

The radical defect (if it be a defect), in the independent form of service, is that it is put entirely into the minister's hands, and the people are receptive but unparticipant. His praying may be extempore, but their praying is just what he puts into their lips. It is a form, and only a form, and, what is worse in the way of formalism, it is a form dependent on his ability or caprice.

But again, there is a difficulty on the part of the ministry of the Congregationalists that they do not seek flexibility, but individuality. As long as a man is responsible in his own feeling and in the expectation of his people, for the shaping of the service he will try to shape it. He is thinking of what he ought to do instead of what ought to be done. Consequently, with any form which can be given him, his natural thought is not how he can use it, but how he can alter it.

Once more out of this very relation of the Congregationalist ministry to the people there comes the chief trouble. Any one who will examine the services of the Prayer Book will see that the first thought is of the thing to be done. Whether it be the daily service of morning and evening worship, the administration of the sacraments, the burial of the dead, matrimony, confirmation, or ordination, the first thing sought is to express the act in view. Something is to be done; the first object of the service is to do this.

Then, around this central rite, whatever it be, are grouped certain features intended to develop its impressiveness and to make it edifying. But all these are strictly subordinated to the leading idea. The child is baptized, the couple are married, the dead is committed to the grave, the congregation worship, confess sins, utter praises, unite in prayers. Here is something which can be made flexible and to which flexibility is possible.

But this we can say to our Congregational friends, that their first need is to know what they have to do, and to do it. Then they can enrich their service. Now their eyes are fixed on the enrichment to the all but entire forgetfulness of that which is to be enriched.

WITHOUT "SENSE, SCIENCE, OR SALVATION."

From *The Christian Advocate*, New York.

Four things are just now attracting special attention to the baleful delusion misnamed "*Christian Science.*" Mrs. Plunkett, a priestess, considered by many the rival and probable successor of Mrs. Mary B. Eddy, the High-Priestess, spiritually divorced herself from her husband and spiritually married Worthington, alias Ward, etc., the hero of half a dozen bigamies, and the most unmitigated scoundrel that America could produce, and thus made a great deal of scandal. Mrs. Plunkett has played various rôles in different parts of the country. In Saratoga and in some of the "best families in this city" she has taught her doctrines, making her dupes believe that she had been an invalid for fifteen years, and that Christian Science had cured her. Many of the citizens of Detroit knew a great deal about her for many years before she began her career as a "healer," and are acquainted with her relation to a once distinguished citizen, and her attempt—still pending, as we believe—to collect a policy of insurance on his life in her favor, which suggest a state of things calculated to prevent surprise at these recent developments.

Much scandal has also been caused by the effects of Christian Science at Long Branch during the present season, where it has become a kind of craze in certain quarters.

The New York *Herald* has published various interviews on the subject which may be more or less exaggerated; but private information of a reliable character assures us that serious domestic discords have already been produced by it.

We would by no means affirm that all who believe in Christian Science are immoral; but that it is closely allied to the doctrine of affinities, liable to promote illicit attachments, and that it has already destroyed the peace of many families by intimacies which have arisen between female "Scientists" and male patients, and the reverse, we know, and therefore unhesitatingly affirm. This system of treatment requires privacy for its most successful operation, and makes use of a peculiar personal influence of the physician over the patient. It is therefore peculiarly adapted to be both a cover for and a stimulator of unholy alliances. Its doctrine of *sin* is perilously near, in many cases quite reaching the denial of the reality of it. The spiritual "medium" so often figuring in divorce cases and separations, and the "free lover" were not more dangerous than some of the practitioners of Christian Science.

Professors of Christianity, when opportunity concurred with allurement, and even those whose piety was genuine, like David and Peter, have fallen into awful wickedness. The difference, however, is that when Christians commit immorality it is in direct opposition to the teachings of the Gospel, and all who become aware of the fact denounce them as hypocrites. Except in a few cases, buttressed by unusual social, pecuniary, or ecclesiastical support, no minister thus denounced, or even generally suspected, is able to maintain himself. We repeat that we bring no charge against all practitioners of Christian Science, nor all believers in it, but point out a tendency, and affirm the existence of a considerable number of cases of the actual state warned against.

Another occasion for unusual notoriety is the taking of one of the local leaders to an Insane Asylum at Warren, Pa., and another to a similar institution at Newburg, O. These women have refused *medical aid*, and also have refused to *eat*. A refusal to eat is the logical outcome of their belief. There has never been anything more absurd than a refusal to use medicine on the ground that the spirit cannot be sick and still depending on food to prevent the sickness resulting from starvation. The insanity of a believer is, indeed, no proof of the falsity of a doctrine. Earnest Christians have become insane. The difference, however, is this: the direct tendency of such superstitions as "Christian Science," *except where the tendency is antagonized by the practice of them for pay*, which tends mightily to keep the reason, is to the overthrow of mental balance; whereas intelligent obedience to the law of God and faith in His promises powerfully sustain the mind against all the moral and emotional troubles, as well as prevent the physical vices which are often the *exciting* causes of insanity, and tend to prevent the growth of those *predisposing* causes, without which the exciting would be comparatively harmless.

But a sensational article published by a syndicate of papers attempting to connect Bishop Newman with "Christian Science," to make it appear that he was not only privately a believer and supporter, but had publicly avowed his belief in "Christian Science," and had in a sermon declared it to be "advanced Christianity," has done more to make it the subject of conversation in the United States than all other things combined. Bishop Newman was probably the most widely-known public speaker in the United States after the death of Henry Ward Beecher and Bishop Simpson, unless Dr. Talmage equalled him in that particular, and his election as Bishop made his name known everywhere, since which he has travelled extensively in all parts of the country.

We thought it not worth while to notice this attempt till from all parts of the United States letters began to come stating that the article was doing Christianity much harm. We are now convinced, notwithstanding what has been said in the press generally, that it is necessary to state the facts here. The only questions are whether Bishop Newman believes in "Christian Science," and whether he has said anything in a sermon which would justify this charge.

As to the facts, then, Bishop Newman says that, in speaking in Des Moines, Iowa, he used the expression "Christian Science," and had no sooner done so than it flashed upon him that the expression might be abused, and he added: "Science touched by the genius of Christianity." He declares that the literature of "Christian Science" is a "literary pemmican of sense and nonsense;" that, so far as he knows, the lectures "are a series of vagaries which have little of sense, science, or salvation." He says "that they substitute one set of physicians for another and always with fees as large," and gives an account of his own practice in a manner which, for clearness, discrimination, and force, it seems to us leaves nothing to be desired.

He then declares :

"It is also a perversion of privileges of Christian prayer and faith. The only Healer in the universe is Christ. His rule is to work through means ; when these fail He can work without them ; and He has reserved to Himself the right to work without them whenever He pleases. When I am ill I send for a learned physician, a trained nurse, and take all remedies prescribed with rational faith and Christian prayer."

When Mrs. Eddy first began to teach her views she did it with such an appearance of piety, and so glossed it with Christian phraseology, that several clergymen of note in Boston and of various denominations publicly indorsed her ; but when they discovered that she used words in a sense entirely different from that given to them in the Scriptures, and that her teachings would undermine Christianity, they were constrained to retract their indorsement.

THE PROPOSAL FOR THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD contributes to the New York *Evangelist* a very able paper on the subject of the Revision of the Westminster Confession. He is decidedly opposed to any such step, and gives his reasons in full for this opposition. These reasons are of two kinds. One kind is founded on the general principle of conservatism, and these reasons are unanswerable in their abstract truth. If there is to be nothing settled in religion, if there is to be a perpetual reopening of questions, then sooner or later all religion resolves itself into the merest matter of speculation. The very essence of the idea of a revelation is, that it is made, is to be ascertained, and then is to stay, and to stay unchanged.

But the other part of Dr. Shedd's argument is not so sound. It is with the concrete application of his principle to the Westminster Confession that we take issue. Of course, from the Doctor's point of view the speculations, opinions, and, as he considers them, logical conclusions of the Westminster Confession are regarded as part of revealed truth. It is just here that the reasoning breaks down. These positions of the Confession may be true, as to that we have no concern, or they may be not true, but true or false they have no place among the things necessary to be believed. The Creed of Christendom, that which can be required of a postulant for admission by baptism into the Christian Church, consists of facts—facts historical—once for all revealed. A past fact is not to be gainsaid. The most that can be done is to restate, for the sake of greater clearness of apprehension, facts which are of the essence of belief, as was done by the councils of Nice and Constantinople with the Apostles' Creed. These councils simply repeated the form of the faith received and held from the beginning in terms which guarded against later denials cunningly framed in ambiguous language. This is not to be changed.

But "views" in regard to God's sovereignty, irresistible decrees, election, and reprobation are not the Creed of Christendom. They are combated by many whom Dr. Shedd would receive into fullest fellowship.

Hence to keep these in that which is regarded as the "Creed" of Presbyterianism may be of importance to Presbyterians, just as the doctrine of ministerial parity may be, but there is no reason why Presbyterians should not change their views on these points, and when so changing, revise to any extent the formulas containing them. We fully concur with Dr. Shedd in the very important principle of holding fast to "the faith once delivered to the saints," but we wholly disagree with him in the belief that this faith is to be found in the Westminster Confession, or that this can be required of believers in general.

In fact, Dr. Shedd admits that it is not required of the Presbyterian laity to receive the statements of the Confession as to the doctrine of the decrees. It is enough for such weak-minded or "little-faith" brethren that they accept the Trinity and the Atonement, though more is desired of them. Now, there is no article of the Creed (the Apostles' as defined by the Nicene) which a communicant can be permitted to deny. There is no distinction of essentials and non-essentials, and this because all are facts and facts of especial importance, because hinging on the question of salvation in the Lord Jesus.

But there are hundreds of other facts which may be held or not, some as pious opinions, some as matters of controverted history. Whether the Mount of the Transfiguration was Tabor or Hermon, whether the term brothers of the Lord meant cousins or half-brothers, and twenty other points we could name are matters open to debate.

The facts of the Creed are not open, and when a part of the Westminster Confession can be dispensed with as a condition of Christian membership, it is plain that the "Confession" is not and cannot be a "Creed."

THE REVISION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CONFESSION.

From *The Christian Intelligencer*, New York.

It is a healthful sign that the Presbyterian Church has not only opened the question of the Revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith, but that the Church is considering it with so much earnestness. Whatever be the result as respects changes or modifications, the agitation will be healthful in stimulating attention to doctrine, and causing on the part of all an examination of standards, which it is very possible many in the Church have never even read. One effect already of the submission to the Presbyteries of the question as to whether any modification is desired, has been a great demand for "The Confession of Faith," which is being read more generally and carefully than ever before. This is well, since in this age, which lays so great emphasis on Christian activity, Christian belief, the only solid foundation of right doing has far too often been put into the background. There is in all Churches today a painful lack of indoctrination—few can give a clear statement of what they believe, and still fewer a reason for the faith they profess. Anything which will lead to careful examination and study of systematized doctrine cannot but be healthful.

The fact that the Presbyterian Church has not shrunk from a frank facing of the question whether its standards express the actual belief of its members or not, is in itself a token of life, and an evidence of faith in itself and its doctrinal position. Furthermore, the spirit in which the discussion is carried on assures that this testing of the foundations will do no harm.

The impression is prevalent that there has been, particularly within the Calvinistic Churches, a gradual drifting away from the tenets of the Fathers, and that great fundamental changes need to be made to conform the Reformation Standards to the belief of to-day. It is already apparent that within the Presbyterian Church at least this is not the case. The changes demanded by the most liberal will be very few, and concern expressions, more than essentials. The inquiry will show that there is no demand for a surrender of the Calvinistic system of doctrine, or weakening as to the divine sovereignty and salvation by grace, but merely a closer conforming of the expression of these doctrines to Scripture teaching and the Church's belief. It is to be hoped that a false conservatism, which scents danger in any change, may not interpose to prevent the modification of expressions, which themselves need explanation, and unless explained, convey to the average mind an erroneous idea of what the Church really believes. There are such in the Westminster Confession—even though they be few—and the interest of the truth, to say nothing of the Church, requires that they be removed. In some way they will be.

The duty of the Church to keep its written Confession in accord with its real beliefs is imperative. What President Gates says in another column respecting the importance of accord between the laws and life of the people in a State, is even more important in the Church.

The expressions that need revision do not, we may remark, primarily burden the consciences of members or ministers within the Presbyterian Church. Subscription to the standards—acceptance of the Confession of Faith—is not required of a person in order to membership. It is sufficient to have faith in Christ and yield one's self to the instruction of the Church and use its means of grace.

The ministers and officers of the Presbyterian Church of this country likewise only subscribe to the Confession of Faith as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," and are hence relieved of the burden which is felt by their brethren in Scotland and England, where the terms of subscription are more exacting. The thing needed here is the protection of the Church's system of doctrine from needless reproach and misrepresentation through the reading of the Confession where there is and can be no explanation of the sense in which the words are understood. That the Church has suffered from just this cause, is pithily presented by the orthodox and well-informed editor of the *Herald and Presbyter*, as follows:

"The senior editor of the *Herald and Presbyter* has lived long enough . . . to know that the Cumberland Presbyterians, by ringing the changes on the alleged fatalism of our standards, have built up a so-called Presbyterian Church as large as the Southern Presbyterian Church; long enough to know that the Methodist circuit-riders, with our Confession in their saddle-bags as a text-book, especially in the central and Western sections of our country, where we and the Baptists had the field, now have churches and members outnumbering both; long enough to know that New England, which at first accepted the Westminster Standards, had to modify them for self-preservation; long enough to know that the Confession of the Westminster Assembly is no longer 'pure and simple,' but has already been amended by us and other Churches without sacrilege, and may be again with impunity; long enough to know that something is needed, and must come; but not quite long enough to know precisely what is best, whether 'a declarative act,' or a new Confession, or a revision of what we have, the probability, at present, being in favor of the latter; but he does not expect 'to live long enough' to see any change that will impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system of doctrine."

Whether relief from the difficulty will be best secured by explanatory articles, such as the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland have adopted, or by a revision of the Confession itself, such as the English Church is engaged on, we, as our brother of the *Herald and Presbyter*, do not venture to affirm, but we are clear something in this direction is called for, and if attained will be not only helpful to the Presbyterian Church, but all Churches holding to the Calvinistic and Reformed system of doctrine. The correct principle and the one to which we apprehend the Church will come is well formulated in the action of the Presbytery of Cincinnati:

"*Resolved,* That Presbytery is not in favor of any revision of the Confession of Faith which would impair the integrity of our doctrinal system, but favor such change as will set forth more clearly the doctrines therein contained and remove any just grounds of misapprehension or criticism."

The principle will doubtless be generally accepted; the difficulty will be in the application of it. As to this, too, we have faith there will come to be substantial and general agreement.

ENGLISH BISHOPS ON BROTHERHOODS.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

Six bishops of the Church of England have been asked to formulate their opinions as to the advisability of reviving the monastic life in England, in the shape of brotherhoods, and it is remarkable that each of these representative men seems averse to decide that the scheme is either impracticable or undesirable. That an unqualified indorsement of methods which are not yet reduced to detail and proved by experiment has not been given in the utterances of these leaders of the Church is not surprising. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who is an enthusiast in the best sense of the word, refuses a decided opinion about projects and plans which are at present so indefinite. Bishop King thinks the scheme likely to be very useful. Bishop Temple has seen the desolation and degradation of the London poor, and concurs in the opinion expressed in the report. The Bishop of Winchester, the learned Dr. Harold Browne, almost echoes the words of Dr. Benson. Perhaps the most valuable opinion of all is that of the Bishop of Chester, Dr. Jayne. The experience of this eminent clergyman in the great parish of Leeds has rendered him capable of forming a judgment at once upon such a matter as this, and of pointing out the dangers to which the revival of brotherhoods in the Church of England is likely to be exposed. Bishop Jayne asserts that such an association of workers as is contemplated is likely to lead to a centralization of parochial energies, such as nowadays is being lost in the division and subdivision of parishes and the dissipation of ministerial forces at scattered points. The Bishop of Chester recollects from history how the regular and the parochial clergy waged with each other something like an internecine war. Human nature likes to be paid back for its sacrifices by some sort of distinction and prestige. The bishop deprecates anything like such a spirit among "the pioneers" of revived monasticism as would lead them to imagine "that they are going to work wonders and be the *élite* of the Church of England." Any such spirit as this will, in Bishop Jayne's judgment, destroy the reality and power of the movement. If modesty and humility, if the spirit of loyalty and proportion be not the ruling spirit of the new scheme, "the virtue will go out of it." It must be begun "without flourish of trumpets."

These wise words are much needed in a feverish, excited, and enthusiastic crisis, such as convocation has created by its recent action touching the present subject. Perhaps they teach the hardest and the most important lesson to be learned with regard to the scheme, and the only lesson which will preserve the scheme from the canker of pharisaism and fanaticism.

THE ORIGIN AND THE USE OF THE CREED.

BY B. A. HINSDALE.

From *The Christian Standard*, Cincinnati.

THE creeds of the second and third centuries are growths or developments, what one trained in the school of natural history might call arrested growths; and the germ is the primitive confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

If the reader will analyze the primitive creeds he will see that they all consist of three principal articles or parts: one relating to God, one to Christ, and the third to the Holy Spirit. How, then, were confessions containing three articles evolved from confessions containing but one? The answer is not far to seek. A second New Testament form is the baptismal formula, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." What may be called the enacting clause of the creeds, "I believe," was suggested by the formula uttered by Peter and approved by our Lord; and its tripartite form was furnished by the formula used at baptism Perhaps the process cannot better be described than to say the soul of the one formula was poured into the body of the other. The term "creed," derived from the first word of the so-called Apostles' Creed, in the Latin *credo*, "I believe." Probably the doxologies of the epistles, such as "Grace be unto you, and peace from God our father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ," contributed something to the stability of the form. Because only the divinity of Jesus is included in the primitive confession, it does not at all follow that it was the only article of Christian teaching and belief. This confession takes for granted the existence of God, which, as Dr. Barrow has well said, "is the foundation of all religion, the support of all virtue, the principal article in all the creeds of all the world." Then was the less need of putting belief in God in the Apostolic Confession from the fact that all the Jews, to whom the Gospel was first preached, were thoroughly grounded in that faith At least, so reasoned the ancient Church. Whether the divinity of the Holy Spirit was distinctly perceived by the first disciples I do not pretend to say; the doctrine seems to be clearly taught in the New Testament; and probably the creed article relating to Him is as old as the one relating to God the Father.

It is not for one moment probable that the creeds found in Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen were the first ones, although they are the oldest that have been preserved. To suppose the Christian consciousness passed by a single leap from the confession of Peter to the confessions of a century and a half later sets at defiance all the analogies of nature and history. That would be to expect the ear—I do not say the full corn in the ear—when there had been no stalk. It is probable that there were creeds in general use which have not been preserved. These creeds, no doubt, appeared in many places nearly simultaneously, produced by the same causes and shaped by the same conditions. The materials of which they were composed have been described above, and they ran somewhat as follows: "I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ the Son, and in the Holy Ghost." This is the framework or skeleton of all the creeds, earlier and later. All the rest of their substance, with the sole exception of the article relating to the Church found in some of them, is but the flesh with which the skeleton is clothed. When this form first appeared no one can say; but it is safe to conclude that the first article was not added to the primitive confession until the struggle between Christianity and paganism had become very distinctly defined. This original creed was neither a conventional nor an individual act; it was not the work of the apostles nor of any one of them; it was the production of the general Church consciousness stimulated by the ministry. Dr. Shedd says: "The Apostles' Creed is the earliest attempt of the Christian mind to systematize the teachings of Scripture." I should rather say that it must have been preceded by more than two centuries by a much simpler one.

If it be charged that this view be hypothetical, I reply that this original creed is not indeed preserved in the remains of Christian antiquity, but that its existence is fairly inferable from all the premises, and that this conclusion is supported by a multitude of analogies in history and nature. Besides, there seems to be traces of it in some of the Fathers. Thus, Cyril of Alexandria says: "Christ offers one confession, that is faith; which we are also accustomed rightly to make, saying we believe in God the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Ghost." And once more: "There is made by us the confession of the right faith in our God the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ his Son, and in one Holy Ghost." There is also a passage in Tertullian of similar import. Speaking of the Holy Spirit as the "leader into all truth," he adds, "which, according to *the Christian sacrament*, is in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." These quotations do not prove that there was so brief a symbol as this extant in the days of Cyril and Tertullian, but they show that which these writers understand the substance of the Confession to be, and probably point to a form that came between the apostolic Confession and the expanded tripartite creeds of the fourth century.

But perhaps the strongest proof of the existence of such a symbol is that furnished by the perfect explanation it gives of the development of the later forms. As soon as we gain this point of view, all difficulty is overcome. The creed of the Ancient Church is an evolution as much as a fish or a flower—an evolution effected by the forces and moulded by the conditions set down in previous articles. The primitive Confession is the seed—the lost Creed is the blade—the creeds of the second and third centuries are the corn—while the full corn we will call the symbol adopted at Nicea in 325.

Once more, the first differentiation produces the three articles, I believe in God, in Christ, and the Holy Spirit. Each of these three differentiated divisions soon begins to exhibit some differentiation of parts; and these secondary differentiations go on until the perfected symbol is produced. Thus, God is described as "the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth," the Son as "the only Son our Lord, conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," etc.

But it may be asked, why were these new particulars added? Specific answer to this inquiry cannot be here given. It is sufficient to say the theological mind was seeking to do what the rabbis would call building a "fence" about the Gospel. In other words, the new articles were the answers of the orthodox to various false doctrines set afloat by heretics. They were added to make the badge or token of discipleship more distinctive.

Before dismissing the subject, it should be remarked that those Christians who hold strongly to tradition seek the origin of the historic Creed outside of the Scriptures altogether. They consider it a part of the traditional doctrine so stoutly contended for by Romanists and by some Protestants. My view is that the Creed was produced by the mind of the Church working under given conditions on the teachings of Scripture; that it was the result of a theological effort. It is quite true that the Gospel was first preached, then written; that the Word preached was orally transmitted for a full century side by side with the evangelical narratives; but that the oral Gospel contained distinctive features not in the written is not probable. This early tradition and the written word were the same in substance.

A second use made of the Creed was in the instruction of catechumens. For reasons that she deemed sufficient, the Church early abandoned the primitive practice of admitting the penitent believer at once to confession and baptism. He was subjected to a special preparatory instruction and training, called his catechuminate. The summary of doctrine found in the Creed admirably served the purpose of this instruction. However, there is reason to suppose that it was so used only in the later period of this discipline. The catechumens were divided into classes, and the symbol seems, at least in some cases, to have been studiously concealed from the lower class. St. Ambrose writes that on a Lord's day the lessons and sermons being ended, and the catechumens of the lower rank being dismissed, that then in the baptistery of the church, he delivered the symbol to some of the *competentes*, or the higher rank of catechumens.

A third and later use of the Creed was made in the public worship. When liturgical worship became prevalent, the Creed was naturally inserted in the liturgy. Special historical illustration is not called for; but it is proper to remark that those churches which employ creeds and liturgies still preserve this custom.

The view herein given of the origin of the Creed is similar in several features to the one proposed by Lord King. "As for the authors thereof, it cannot be denied but that they were several and many; the Creed was neither the work of one man nor of one day, but during a long tract of time passed successively through several hands ere it arrived at its present perfection; the composure of it was gradual and not instantaneous."

The original significance of confession has been sufficiently set forth already. As early as the time of Tertullian the confession was called the Christian sacrament. St. Ambrose called it *militæ sacramentum*, the oath of the Christian soldier. The primitive confessions and the later creeds alike were used as solemn interrogations at baptism. Justin Martyr assures us "that none were baptized unless they did first declare their assent to the doctrine and faith of the Gospel." Another ancient writer says that those who came to the sacred laver of regeneration confessed, saying, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost." Rufinus relates that in his time at Rome the ancient custom of persons about to be baptized publicly to recite the Creed was still retained. How soon the Creed became so stereotyped that a prescribed form of words were recited by the confessor, as is generally the case now in orthodox churches, no one can tell; but I see no reason to suppose that such was the state of things in the time of Irenæus and Tertullian. The fluency of the Creed in their hands would seem to forbid such a supposition. No doubt, for a long time the minister asserted a large liberty in the choice of words, but the tendency for religious formulæ and rites to become fixed and rigid finally prevailed.

I.

ON AGNOSTICISM.

A Paper Read at the Manchester Church Congress, 1888.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.,

PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL; PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

[We propose to reprint, in serial form, the recent papers by Principal Henry Wace, D.D., Professor Huxley, Rt. Rev. Dr. Magee, Mr. W. H. Mallock, and Mrs. Humphry Ward, on Christianity and Agnosticism, which are a valuable and permanent contribution to a great controversy. The fact that the reprint in book form put upon the American market was so eagerly bought up that the edition was quickly exhausted shows the widespread interest in the discussion, and induces us to believe that many will thank us for thus putting the papers in their hands.—ED.]

WHAT is agnosticism? In the new Oxford "Dictionary of the English Language," we are told that "an agnostic is one who holds that the existence of anything beyond and behind natural phenomena is unknown, and (so far as can be judged) unknowable, and especially that a First Cause and an unseen world are subjects of which we know nothing." The same authority quotes a letter from Mr. R. H. Hutton, stating that the word was suggested in his hearing, at a party held in 1869, by Professor Huxley, who took it from St. Paul's mention of the altar at Athens to the Unknown God. "Agnostic," it is further said, in a passage quoted from the *Spectator* of June 11th, 1876, "was the name demanded by Professor Huxley for those who disclaimed atheism, and believed with him in an unknown and unknowable God, or, in other words, that the ultimate origin of all things must be some cause unknown and unknowable." Again, the late honored bishop of this diocese is quoted as saying, in the *Manchester Guardian*, in 1880, that "the agnostic neither denied nor affirmed God. He simply put him on one side." The designation was suggested, therefore, for the purpose of avoiding a direct denial of beliefs respecting God such as are asserted by our faith. It proceeds, also, from a scientific source, and claims the scientific merit, or habit, of reserving opinion respecting matters not known or proved.

Now we are not here concerned with this doctrine as a mere question of abstract philosophy respecting the limits of our natural capacities. We have to consider it in relation to the Church and to Christianity, and the main consideration which it is the purpose of this paper to suggest is that, in this relation, the adoption of the term agnostic is only an attempt to shift the issue, and that it involves a mere evasion. A Christian Catechism says: "First, I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me, and all the world; secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me, and all mankind; thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God." The agnostic says: "How do you know all that? I consider I have no means of knowing these things you assert respecting God. I do not know, and cannot know, that God is a Father, and that he has a Son; and I do not and cannot know that such a Father made me, or that such a Son redeemed me." But the Christian did not speak of what he knew, but of what he believed. The first word of a Christian is not "I know," but "I believe." He professes, not a science, but a faith; and at baptism he accepts, not a theory, but a creed.

Now it is true that in one common usage of the word, belief is practically equivalent to opinion. A man may say he believes in a scientific theory, meaning that he is strongly of opinion that it is true; or, in still looser language, he may say he believes it is going to be a fine day. I would observe, in passing, that even in this sense of the word, a man who refused to act upon what he could not know would be a very unpractical person. If you are suffering from an obscure disease, you go to a doctor to obtain, not his knowledge of your malady, but his opinion; and upon that opinion, in defiance of other opinions, even an emperor may have to stake his life. Similarly, from what is known of the proceedings in Parliament respecting the Manchester Ship-Canal, it may be presumed that engineers were not unanimous as to the possibilities and advantages of that undertaking; but Manchester men were content to act upon the best opinion, and to stake fortunes on their belief in it. However, it may be sufficient to have just alluded to the old and unanswered contention of Bishop Butler that, even if Christian belief and Christian duty were mere matters of probable opinion, a man who said in regard to them, "I do not know, and therefore I will not act," would be abandoning the first principle of human energy. He might be a philosopher; but he would not be a man—not at least, I fancy, according to the standard of Lancashire.

But there is another sense of the word "belief," which is of far more importance for our present subject. There is belief which is founded on the assurances of another person, and upon our trust in him. This sort of belief is not opinion, but faith; and it is this which has been the greatest force in creating religions, and through them in moulding civilizations. What made the Mohammedan world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Mohammed. And what made the Christian world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Jesus Christ and his apostles. This is not mere believing about things; it is believing a man and believing in a man. Now, the point of importance for the present argument is, that the chief articles of the Christian creed are directly dependent on personal assurances and personal declarations, and that our acceptance of them depends on personal trust. Why do we believe that Jesus Christ redeemed all mankind? Because he said so. There is no other ultimate ground for it. The matter is not one open to the observation of our faculties; and as a matter of science we are not in a position to know it. The case is the same with his divine Sonship and the office of his Spirit. He reveals himself by his words and acts; and in revealing himself he reveals his Father, and the Spirit who proceeds from both. His resurrection and his miracles afford us, as St. Paul says, assurance of his divine mission. But for our knowledge of his offices in relation to mankind, and of his nature in relation to God, we rest on his own words, confirmed and explained by those of his apostles. Who can dream of knowing, as a matter of science, that he is the Judge of quick and dead? But he speaks himself, in the Sermon on the Mount, of that day when men will plead before him, and when he will decide their fate; and Christians include in their creed a belief in that statement respecting the unseen and future world.

But if this be so, for a man to urge as an escape from this article of belief that he has no means of a scientific knowledge of the unseen world, or of the future, is irrelevant. His difference from Christians lies not in the fact that he has no knowledge of these things, but that he does not believe the authority on which they are stated. He may prefer to call himself an agnostic; but his real name is an older one—he is an infidel: that is to say, an unbeliever. The word infidel, perhaps, carries an unpleasant significance. Perhaps it is right that it should. It is, and it ought to be, an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe Jesus Christ. It is, indeed, an awful thing to say. But even men who are not conscious of all it involves shrink from the ungraciousness, if from nothing more, of treating the beliefs inseparably associated with that sacred Person as an illusion. This, however, is what is really meant by agnosticism; and the time seems to have come when it is necessary to insist upon the fact.

Of course, there may be numberless attempts at respectful excuses or evasions, and there is one in particular which may require notice. It may be asked how far we can rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects. Now it is unnecessary for the general argument before us to enter on those questions respecting the authenticity of the Gospel narratives, which ought to be regarded as settled by M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case. Apart from all disputed points of criticism, no one practically doubts that our Lord lived, and that he died on the cross, in the most intense sense of filial relation to his Father in heaven, and that he bore testimony to that Father's providence, love, and grace toward mankind. The Lord's Prayer affords sufficient evidence upon these points. If the Sermon on the Mount alone be added, the whole unseen world, of which the agnostic refuses to know anything, stands unveiled before us. There you see revealed the divine Father and Creator of all things, in personal relation to his creatures, hearing their prayers, witnessing their actions, caring for them and rewarding them. There you hear of a future judgment administered by Christ himself, and of a heaven to be hereafter revealed, in which those who live as the children of that

Father, and who suffer in the cause and for the sake of Christ himself, will be abundantly rewarded. If Jesus Christ preached that sermon, made those promises, and taught that prayer, then any one who says that we know nothing of God, or of a future life, or of an unseen world, says that he does not believe Jesus Christ. Since the days when our Lord lived and taught, at all events, agnosticism has been impossible without infidelity.

Let it be observed, moreover, that to put the case in this way is not merely to make an appeal to authority. It goes further than that. It is in a vital respect an appeal to experience, and so far to science itself. It is an appeal to what I hope may be taken as, confessedly, the deepest and most sacred moral experience which has ever been known. No criticism worth mentioning doubts the story of the Passion; and that story involves the most solemn attestation, again and again, of truths of which an agnostic coolly says he knows nothing. An agnosticism which knows nothing of the relation of man to God must not only refuse belief to our Lord's most undoubted teaching, but must deny the reality of the spiritual convictions in which he lived and died. It must declare that his most intimate, most intense beliefs, and his dying aspirations, were an illusion. Is that supposition tolerable? It is because it is not tolerable that men would fain avoid facing it, and would have themselves called agnostics rather than infidels; but I know not whether this cool and supercilious disregard of that solemn teaching, and of that sacred life and death, be not more offensive than the downright denials which look their responsibility boldly in the face, and say, not only that they do not know, but that they do not believe. This question of living faith in a living God and Saviour, with all it involves, is too urgent and momentous a thing to be put aside with a philosophical "I don't know." The best blood of the world has been shed over it; the deepest personal, social, and even political problems are still bound up with it. The intensest moral struggles of humanity have centred round this question, and it is really intolerable that all this bitter experience of men and women who have trusted and prayed, and suffered and died, in faith, should be set aside as not germane to a philosophical argument.

But, to say the least, from a purely scientific point of view, there is a portentous fallacy in the manner in which, in agnostic arguments, the testimony, not only of our Lord, but of psalmists, prophets, apostles, and saints is disregarded. So far as the Christian faith can be treated as a scientific question, it is a question of experience; and what is to be said of a science which leaves out of account the most conspicuous and most influential experience in the matter? One thing may be said with confidence: that it defeats itself, by disregarding the greatest force with which it has to contend. While philosophers are arguing as to the abstract capacities of human thought, as though our Lord had never lived and died, he himself is still speaking; his words, as recorded by his apostles and evangelists, are still echoing over human hearts, touching their inmost affections, appealing to their deepest needs, commanding their profoundest trust, and awakening in them an apprehension of that divine relation and those unseen realities in which their spirits live. While agnostics are committing the enormous scientific as well as moral blunder of considering the relations of men to God and to an unseen world without taking his evidence into account, and then presuming to judge the faith he taught by their own partial knowledge, his word is still heard, in penetrating and comfortable words, bidding men believe in God and believe also in himself. He, after all, is the one sufficient answer to agnosticism, and—I will take the liberty of adding—to atheism and to pessimism also. Not merely his authority, though that would be enough, but his life, his soul, himself.

Accordingly, as our object here is to consider how to deal with these difficulties and objections, what these considerations would seem to point out is that we should take care to let Christ and Christ's own message be heard, and not to endure that they should be allowed to stand aside while a philosophical debate is proceeding. Philosophers are slow in these matters. They are still disputing, after some twenty-five hundred years of discussion, what is the true principle for determining moral right and wrong. Meanwhile men have been content to live by the Ten Commandments, and the main lines of duty are plain. In the same way religion has preceded the philosophy of religion, and men can be made sensible of their relation to God whether it can be philosophically explained or not. The Psalms, the Prophets, and, above all, the Gospels, are plain evidence, in matter of fact, that men are in relation to God and owe duties to him. Let men be made to attend to the facts; let them hear those simple, plain, and earnest witnesses; above all, let them hear the voice of Christ, and they will at least believe whatever may be the possibilities of knowledge. In a word, let us imitate St. Paul when his converts were perplexed by Greek philosophies at Corinth: "I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God; for I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified."

II.

AGNOSTICISM.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

Within the last few months the public has received much and varied information on the subject of agnostics, their tenets, and even their future. Agnosticism exercised the orators of the Church Congress at Manchester.* It has been furnished with a set of "articles" fewer, but not less rigid, and certainly not less consistent than the thirty-nine; its nature has been analyzed, and its future severely predicted by the most eloquent of that prophetical school whose Samuel is Auguste Comte. It may still be a question, however, whether the public is as much the wiser as might be expected, considering all the trouble that has been taken to enlighten it. Not only are the three accounts of the agnostic position sadly out of harmony with one another, but I propose to show cause for my belief that all three must be seriously questioned by any one who employs the term "agnostic" in the sense in which it was originally used. The learned principal of King's College, who brought the topic of agnosticism before the Church Congress, took a short and easy way of settling the business:

> But if this be so, for a man to urge, as an escape from this article of belief, that he has no means of a scientific knowledge of the unseen world, or of the future, is irrelevant. His difference from Christians lies not in the fact that he has no knowledge of these things, but that he does not believe the authority on which they are stated. He may prefer to call himself an agnostic; but his real name is an older one — he is an infidel; that is to say, an unbeliever. The word infidel, perhaps, carries an unpleasant significance. Perhaps it is right that it should. It is, and it ought to be, an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ.

And in the course of the discussion which followed, the Bishop of Peterborough departed so far from his customary courtesy and self-respect as to speak of "cowardly agnosticism" (p. 262).

So much of Dr. Wace's address either explicitly or implicitly concerns me, that I take upon myself to deal with it; but, in so doing, it must be understood that I speak for myself alone; I am not aware that there is any sect of Agnostics; and if there be, I am not its acknowledged prophet or pope. I desire to leave to the Comtists the entire monopoly of the manufacture of imitation ecclesiasticism.

Let us calmly and dispassionately consider Dr. Wace's appreciation of agnosticism. The agnostic, according to his view, is a person who says he has no means of attaining a scientific knowledge of the unseen world or of the future; by which somewhat loose phraseology Dr. Wace presumably means the theological unseen world and future. I cannot think this description happy either in form or substance, but for the present it may pass. Dr. Wace continues, that is not "his difference from Christians." Are there, then, any Christians who say that they know nothing about the unseen world and the future? I was ignorant of the fact, but I am ready to accept it on the authority of a professional theologian, and I proceed to Dr. Wace's next proposition.

The real state of the case, then, is that the agnostic "does not believe the authority" on which "these things" are stated, which authority is Jesus Christ. He is simply an old-fashioned "infidel," who is afraid to own to his right name. As "Presbyter is priest writ large," so is "agnostic" the mere Greek equivalent for the Latin "infidel." There is an attractive simplicity about this solution of the problem; and it has that advantage of being somewhat offensive to the persons attacked, which is so dear to the less refined sort of controversialist. The agnostic says, "I cannot find good evidence that so and so is true." "Ah," says his adversary, seizing his opportunity, "then you declare that Jesus Christ was untruthful, for he said so and so;" a very telling method of rousing prejudice. But suppose that the value of the evidence as to what Jesus may have said and done, and as to the exact nature and scope of his authority, is just that which the agnostic finds it most difficult to determine? If I venture to doubt that the Duke of Wellington gave the command, "Up, Guards, and at 'em!" at Waterloo, I do not think that even Dr. Wace would accuse me of disbelieving the duke. Yet it would be just as reasonable to do this as to accuse any one of denying what Jesus said before the preliminary question as to what he did say is settled.

---

* See the "Official Report of the Church Congress held at Manchester," October, 1888, pp. 253, 254.

Now, the question as to what Jesus really said and did is strictly a scientific problem, which is capable of solution by no other methods than those practised by the historian and the literary critic. It is a problem of immense difficulty, which has occupied some of the best heads in Europe for the last century; and it is only of late years that their investigations have begun to converge toward one conclusion.[*]

That kind of faith which Dr. Wace describes and lauds is of no use here. Indeed, he himself takes pains to destroy its evidential value.

"What made the Mohammedan world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Mohammed. And what made the Christian world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Jesus Christ and his apostles" (*loc. cit.*, p. 253). The triumphant tone of this imaginary catechism leads me to suspect that its author has hardly appreciated its full import. Presumably, Dr. Wace regards Mohammed as an unbeliever, or, to use the term which he prefers, infidel; and considers that his assurances have given rise to a vast delusion, which has led, and is leading, millions of men straight to everlasting punishment. And this being so, the "trust and faith" which have "made the Mohammedan world," in just the same sense as they have "made the Christian world," must be trust and faith in falsehood. No man who has studied history, or even attended to the occurrences of every-day life, can doubt the enormous practical value of trust and faith; but as little will he be inclined to deny that this practical value has not the least relation to the reality of the objects of that trust and faith. In examples of patient constancy of faith and of unswerving trust, the "Acta Martyrum" do not excel the annals of Babism.

The discussion upon which we have now entered goes so thoroughly to the root of the whole matter; the question of the day is so completely, as the author of "Robert Elsmere" says, the value of testimony, that I shall offer no apology for following it out somewhat in detail; and, by way of giving substance to the argument, I shall base what I have to say upon a case, the consideration of which lies strictly within the province of natural science, and of that particular part of it known as the physiology and pathology of the nervous system.

I find, in the second Gospel (chap. 5), a statement, to all appearance intended to have the same evidential value as any other contained in that history. It is the well-known story of the devils who were cast out of a man, and ordered, or permitted, to enter into a herd of swine, to the great loss and damage of the innocent Gerasene, or Gadarene, pig-owners. There can be no doubt that the narrator intends to convey to his readers his own conviction that this casting out and entering in were effected by the agency of Jesus of Nazareth; that, by speech and action, Jesus enforced this conviction; nor does any inkling of the legal and moral difficulties of the case manifest itself.

On the other hand, everything that I know of physiological and pathological science leads me to entertain a very strong conviction that the phenomena ascribed to possession are as purely natural as those which constitute small-pox; everything that I know of anthropology leads me to think that the belief in demons and demoniacal possession is a mere survival of a once universal superstition, and that its persistence at the present time is pretty much in the inverse ratio of the general instruction, intelligence, and sound judgment of the population among whom it prevails. Everything that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanor of evil example. Again, the study of history, and especially of that of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, leaves no shadow of doubt on my mind that the belief in the reality of possession and of witchcraft, justly based, alike by Catholics and Protestants, upon this and innumerable other passages in both the Old and New Testaments, gave rise, through the special influence of Christian ecclesiastics, to the most horrible persecutions and judicial murders of thousands upon thousands of innocent men, women, and children. And when I reflect that the record of a plain and simple declaration upon such an occasion as this, that the belief in witchcraft and possession is wicked nonsense, would have rendered the long agony of mediæval humanity impossible, I am prompted to reject, as dishonoring, the supposition that such declaration was withheld out of condescension to popular error.

(*To be continued.*)

---

[*] Dr. Wace tells us, "It may be asked how far we can rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects." And he seems to think the question appropriately answered by the assertion that it "ought to be regarded as settled by M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case." I thought I knew M. Renan's works pretty well, but I have contrived to miss this "practical" (I wish Dr. Wace had defined the scope of that useful adjective) surrender. However, as Dr. Wace can find no difficulty in pointing out the passage of M. Renan's writings, by which he feels justified in making his statement, I shall wait for further enlightenment, contenting myself, for the present, with remarking that if M. Renan were to retract and do penance in Notre Dame to-morrow for any contributions to Biblical criticism that may be specially his property, the main results of that criticism as they are set forth in the works of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar, for example, would not be sensibly affected.

PARAGRAPHIC.

A religious newspaper speaks very severely of the effects of the recent vacation. Its terms seem to imply that not only Church work has been suspended, but religion dead in the land during the hot weather. There is something shocking in the words, "Church work, which has been suspended, *i.e.*, by the vacation for weeks, will begin anew, and soon we shall be hard at it, serving the Lord, in revivals of religion."

Has religion been killed by the dog-days that it has to be revived and brought to life again at the Equinox? Yet we read that some days ago "it was impossible to find a Protestant minister in Waterbury, Conn., a city of 30,000 inhabitants, to perform a marriage ceremony."

What consolation, then, would there be for the dying and the sick in Waterbury, Conn.? For our own part, we do not believe that religion disappears with the frosts, that Church work ceases when the birds begin to sing, or that any city in the Union of 30,000 people was ever without a "Protestant" minister at least within easy call.—*N. Y. Churchman.*

The origin of the name Chautauqua is said to be the exclamation of the Indian chief who, driven to desperation by the energetic tongue of his squaw, plunged headlong into the lake, exclaiming, as he went, "she talk away, she talk away." There is a terrible suspicion that the ghost of the old squaw still haunts the shades of Chautauqua, and bewitches the tongues of not overwise speakers.—*N. Y. Observer.*

Salvation Army.—Boothism is but another of the excrescences which caricature the face of much of modern Christianity. It has receded from its professed undenominationalism, it has done little or nothing to break through the inert mass of practical heathenism, and it has unsettled many who were quietly pursuing the old paths. A letter which Mr. Llewellyn Davis wrote in the *Times* very trenchantly deals more particularly with the second of these assertions. Mr. Davis speaks from intimate knowledge of the facts derived from exceptional opportunities, and he declares without hesitation that the work of the "Army," in that district at least where his own church is situated, is a distinct failure. He failed, as others failed, to secure the names of any genuine converts from the class for which the "Army" was presumed to be started. Many persons of religious character and susceptible dispositions were attracted to it, but none, permanently from the uncared-for and disreputable classes whose exclusive champion Mr. Booth tried to prove himself before Mr. Matthews. It is time that this miserable travesty of religion should be put to the test, and that the philanthropic people who so largely support its peculiar methods should understand that the work which Mr. Booth is doing is a work of destruction, not of construction, and that the amelioration of the outcast and poor of London is going on steadily through the old-fashioned agencies, not by means of this newest of shams.—*The Church Times.*

In discussing the death penalty, the New York *Observer* has given to the public an expression worthy of being printed in every paper in the United States. It says: "Abolishing the death penalty does not indicate an increase of the sense of the sacredness of human life, but exactly the contrary. It is a great appreciation of the value of the criminal's life, and a comparatively small appreciation of the value of the life of his victims."—*The Christian Advocate.*

Professor Wiggins, after prophesying falsely for several years, has struck a coincidence in this year. He certainly said this would be a year of dire disasters and calamity by fire, floods, and cyclones, and already 15,000 lives, as an exchange notes, and property to $100,000,000 have been destroyed by these agents. No matter what a man predicts, all he has to do is to keep on long enough in this changeful world and he will hit it, and he can rely on the fools to forget the failures and go wild with wonder or delight when his one coincidence arrives.—*The Christian Advocate.*

While some Christians complain that they can find no opportunity to do good, others are embarrassed because of the multitude of inviting openings, only a few of which they can find time to enter. The difference between these two classes of Christians is not in their circumstances, but in their spiritual discernment. Some men are blind to their opportunities. They stand idle all the day, while the fields are white already to the harvest. They can see how others may be useful, but no work seems suited to their abilities. If the eyes of idle Christians could once be opened, they would be as much surprised as Elisha's servant was when he saw the mountains covered with the horses and chariots of God.—*The Christian Advocate.*

It has been urged that we ought to love our neighbor upon earth as we shall love him in heaven; but duty and ability do not go hand in hand. When we meet in the better land, we will have more power to love, and both our neighbor and ourselves will have grown more lovely. We must do our best here, however, to reach the heavenly standard.—*The Interior.*

We all know that worry kills. Unfortunately it only kills the worried. The worrier thrives: like symbolic Jeshurun he waxes fat and kicks in a lively fashion. Here is a case of the survival of the unfittest.—*Christian at Work.*

Fuller says that illustrations are the windows, and arguments the pillars of a discourse. A Roman Catholic priest in Victoria recently exhibited his skill in pulpit illustration in a remarkable way. He took a walnut into the pulpit and said that nature had given to man in this nut a vivid figure of the present condition of Christianity in the world. The shell, he said, hard, barren and unprofitable, represented Methodism. The skin, bitter and useless, Presbyterianism. "Now," he proceeded, "I will show you the Holy Roman Church."

Placing the nut on the edge of the pulpit he took a book and cracked it. But the kernel, representing the Roman Church, was rotten!

This certainly was an example, in the last member of his illustration, at least, of the inspiration either of Balaam or of the beast he rode upon. Who can wonder that the ass of the son of Bosor spake, when even a rotten walnut, in the present instance, just as plainly "forbade the madness of the prophet."—*The Churchman.*

A Presbyterian paper says: "If the revision agitation continues and each church now holding the Confession of Faith revises independently the prospect for a large crop of new sects will be bright indeed. . . . According to Dr. Kerr's history there are already about twenty Presbyterian bodies adhering to the same symbols. If each divides into fragments in the course of revision there may be forty or fifty before the century closes."—*The Churchman.*

THE

MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1. NOVEMBER, 1889. No. 2.

THE POSITION OF WOMEN AMONG THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.

BY J. DONALDSON, LL.D., SENIOR PRINCIPAL, UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), September, 1889

AT the outset of this article I wish to forewarn my readers that probably many of them will be greatly disappointed by the results of my investigations. It is a prevalent opinion that woman owes her present high position to Christianity, and the influences of the Teutonic mind. I used to believe this opinion, but in the first three centuries I have not been able to see that Christianity had any favourable effect on the position of women, but, on the contrary, that it tended to lower their character and contract the range of their activity. Unquestionably in the Gospels women occupy a prominent position. Many of them followed Christ and ministered to Him. With a woman who had had five husbands and was living with a man not her husband, He holds the most profound conversation, and to her He proclaims the grandest truths of His revelation. And the women of His day and country seem to have had great liberty of movement and action. One of them, described by St. Luke as "a sinner in the city," finds her way into the house of a Pharisee with whom He was dining, pours a box of ointment on His feet, and washes His feet with the hair of her head. Christ mingles freely in the marriage festivities where His mother and doubtless other female relatives were present. His intercourse with the family of Bethany is of the most unrestrained character, and He talks to both sisters on the highest subjects. And, according to St. John, His first appearance after His resurrection is made to a woman, Mary of Magdala, from whom He had expelled seven demons. But in the Gospels there is no special doctrine propounded in regard to women, and if there is any approach to this, it exhibits great mildness, if we take the story of the woman caught in adultery as genuine. It is when we come to the writings of St. Paul that opinions are pronounced in regard to marriage and the conduct of women, and there can be no doubt that these opinions are of a stern and restrictive nature. The Ebionites explained the Apostle's conversion by stating that he was, as he himself allowed, a native of Tarsus, that he was not a Jew, but a Greek with a Greek father and a Greek mother, that he went up to Jerusalem and stayed there for some time, that he fell in love with the high priest's daughter, became in consequence a proselyte and asked her in marriage, but on being refused he was enraged, and wrote against circumcision, the Sabbath, and the law. Some have thought that there is a bitterness against women in the writings of St. Paul which can be explained only by some such rejection as that related by the Ebionites. His words had a great influence on the formation of opinion in regard to women in the ancient Church. They fell in with the tendencies of the times, and were made the groundwork and support of the depreciation of marriage, which became prevalent in the third and fourth centuries of our era.

Christianity also soon brought with it a new state of feeling in regard to questions relating to sex. Acts that had been indifferent now became morally wrong, and the Christian writers inquire minutely into points which had not previously been discussed. The Christian writers are particularly frank in their treatment of these questions. Their sense of decency is quite different from that of the moderns, and the consequence is that it is not possible for a modern writer to give a full exposition of their ideas and reasonings.

There are two Christian books belonging, the one to the beginning of the third century, the other to the beginning of the fourth, that make large reference to the duties and position of women. The first is the "Pædagogus," or Instructor, of Clement of Alexandria. In this work the Alexandrian Father guides the Christian in all the affairs of common life. He exhibits how the Christian ought to behave at meals, what food and drink he ought to take, how long he should sleep, what kind of clothes he ought to wear, how he ought to conduct himself in church, and similar matters. Now in dealing with the duties of women he refuses to employ any euphemism. A spade with him must be a spade or it is a lie. God created man and woman, every part of them, and "no one," he says, "ought to be ashamed of naming what God was not ashamed to create," and to go about the bush is to act in disrespect of Him. Besides, he thought it very important that every detail of the Christian life should be directed according to the instructions of Divine Reason, and therefore he would have regarded it a dereliction of duty if he had not discussed all that concerns the functions of women. But the feeling of the present age is for euphemism and concealment, and accordingly when we had to translate Clement's works into English, in the Ante-Nicene Library, there were portions so completely opposed to modern ideas of decency that we considered it better to present them in a Latin and not an English dress. The same peculiarity characterizes the other work which I mentioned—"The Banquet of the Ten Virgins," by Methodius. In this book ten virgins praise virginity; but the virgins show a remarkably intimate acquaintance with the physiology and aberrations of women. Now in the case of Clement no one can doubt the purity and simplicity of his mind, and his expositions, though they have been denounced by some divines, are absolutely devoid of all pruriency. Perhaps there is a little of the meretricious in the style of the Banquet, for the writer is imitating somewhat unsuccessfully the Banquet of Plato; but the language is entirely consistent with perfect purity, and the difference from our own times is to be attributed to the sentiments of the age, not to a debasement of character.

There is another remark that has to be made before we proceed with our subject. We may have to employ the term Christianity frequently; but a great mistake would be committed if it were assumed that the term has always the same meaning. There is the Christianity of Christ, the Christianity of the first century, the Christianity of Hildebrand, of Luther, and of Calvin. Christianity is different as it appears in different ages and persons. In the early centuries the Christianity of Rome differed from that of Greece and of Africa, and it is not to be assumed that, because one Christian writer mentions a practice, that practice was therefore universal in the Church. So when we quote a writer, that writer is of good authority for his own opinion or practice, of tolerably good authority for the doctrine and practice of the Christianity of his own country and age, but more faintly for the Christianity of other countries and ages.

At the time when Christianity dawned on the world, women had attained, as we have seen in our articles on Roman women, great freedom, power and influence in the Roman Empire. Tradition was in favor of restriction, but by a concurrence of circumstances women had been liberated from the enslaving fetters of the old legal forms, and they enjoyed freedom of intercourse in society; they walked and drove in the public thoroughfares with veils that did not conceal their faces, they dined in the company of men, they studied literature and philosophy, they took part in political movements, they were allowed to defend their own law cases if they liked, and they helped their husbands in the government of provinces and the writing of books. One would have imagined that Christianity would have favoured the extension of woman's freedom. For Christianity itself was one of the most daring revolutions which the world has ever seen. It defied all past customs, it aimed at the overthrow of the religions of the world, it overleapt the barriers of nationality, and it desired to fuse all mankind into one family and one faith. Necessarily, such a movement was accompanied by much excitement and agitation, but when enthusiasm sways any association of men, and they live in a state of ferment, they break in pieces the bonds of custom—those very bonds which most firmly chain women down to a slavish position of routine. Accordingly, at the very first stage women take a prominent part. But in a short time this state of matters ceases in the Church, and women are seen only in two capacities—as martyrs and as deaconesses.

As martyrs they presented a magnificent spectacle of what poor weak woman can dare and do when under the impulse of an inspiring faith. There are especially two genuine Ante-Nicene writings which relate the courage of women under the agonies of trial. The first is the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, written in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and the second narrates the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas in the beginning of the third century. In the letter of the Church of Lyons the most conspicuous woman is a delicate young slave of the name of Blandina, to whom every possible kind of torture was applied, until her body was a mass of deformity, but no word could be wrung out of her in denial of her Lord. "I am a Christian," she said, "and there is no evil done amongst us." The torturers, finding her resolution immovable, allowed her a short respite. After an interval of a day or two she was taken to the amphitheatre to be exposed to the wild beasts. She was suspended upon a cross in the midst of these animals, but they did not touch her, and she was conveyed back to the noisome and dark dungeons of her prison. Neither wild beast nor prison altered her determination. The magistrates were very anxious that she should recant, and day by day they led her to the scenes of torture, in the hope that she would be frightened by the terrible sufferings which she saw her companions endure, and on each occasion they urged her to swear by the gods. Blandina remained steadfast, and on the last day of the gladiatorial shows she was taken to the amphitheatre. There she was scourged and roasted on a red-hot iron chair, then enclosed in a net and tossed by a bull, and finally stabbed, triumphant in the faith of a glorious resurrection and a blessed union with her Lord. The martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas was carried out in similar circumstances. Felicitas was a slave. Vivia Perpetua belonged to the higher ranks. She had received a good education, and was married at the time of her apprehension, and had a child at the breast. She was only twenty-two years of age. Her father was still a heathen, and urged her by every possible form of argument and appeal to renounce her faith, but she was firm. She was then cast into a dungeon and suffered agonies on account of the darkness and separation from her child. But her friends were influential enough to procure an alleviation of her hardships, and she was permitted to have her infant and to receive visits from her Christian brethren. After some days the prisoners were taken to the town hall and tried. Perpetua's father again assailed her with entreaties to swear by the gods, and so did the Roman procurator. "Spare," said the latter, "the grey hairs of your father, spare the infancy of your boy, offer sacrifice for the well-being of the emperors." But Perpetua was unmoved, and to the fatal question "Are you a Christian?" she replied "I am a Christian," and was condemned to the wild beasts. She returned to her dungeon, there to await the day of the games. On that day the various prisoners were conveyed to the amphitheatre, and when the turn of the young women came, Felicitas and Perpetua were placed in nets and exposed to the attacks of a mad cow. Perpetua was first tossed up in the air and fell on her loins, but was not injured so much as to be unable to help Felicitas when she was crushed to the ground, for she gave her hand to her companion and lifted her up. The savage fury of the populace was appeased for a time, and a demand was made for other combatants. As the evening drew on, all the Christians alive were summoned to receive the final sword-thrust; they kissed each other and then submitted to their fate. Then the writer of the narrative exclaims, "O most brave and blessed martyrs, O truly called and chosen unto the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." Every honour was heaped after death on the women who thus suffered for Christ's sake, and their ashes and other relics were supposed to exercise a sanctifying and miraculous influence; but during their lives it was their duty to stay at home and manage the affairs of their household and not meddle in teaching or any spiritual function.

Let us look now at the organization of the church. Various ideas are entertained in regard to this subject. The view that I take of it is that the organization was the outcome of the necessities of the case directed by the institutions of the age and the place. The idea that regulated the forms of organization was that each member should contribute to the Church, in an orderly way, any gift that God had given him. And, in the first enthusiasm of the Christian movement, women were allowed to do whatever they were fitted to do. Accordingly, we meet in the early Church with prophetesses. Special mention is made of the four daughters of Philip. The women combine with the men in spreading the Gospel. St. Paul calls several of them his fellow-labourers, and one he designates a minister or deaconess (as some have translated it) of the Church in Cenchreæ. But not many generations elapse when all this comes to an end, and we hear only of two classes of women in connection with the administration of Church affairs. The first is that of widows. The Church supported its own poor, and took upon itself especially the maintenance of widows and orphans. For the widows work was found. Some persons were required to visit sick women, to convey assistance to poor women, and to rear orphan children. Widows were selected for this service, but not all widows. Certain qualifications were deemed essential. The widow must at least be sixty years of age; she must have made up her mind not to marry again, and she must have experience in the nursing of children, so as to give suitable advice to mothers in their distress and difficulties. And, of course, she must have a good character for sobriety, discretion, and piety. In process of time the duties which had been assigned to them were transferred to another class of women, though the widows still continued to exist as a separate body. This new class received the name of deaconesses. Some have thought that deaconesses existed in the apostolic times, and others have supposed that the office was of early origin but confined to special localities. It seems to me that the passages on which these opinions have been based do not substantiate a fixed and definite office, but mere casual and sporadic services. It is towards the middle of the third century that in all probability the new order became common in all the Churches, for then the circumstances were such as to demand its existence. First of all, widowhood had fallen in the spiritual market and virginity had risen. It was not wrong for the widow to have married, but the act implied a certain weakness, and she thereby contracted a stain which rendered her less fit for the service of the Church. Accordingly, even in the time of Tertullian, virgins were elected for the duties and called widows. "I know plainly,"* he says, "that in a certain place a virgin of less than twenty years of age has been placed in the order of widows." He himself objects in the strongest manner to this innovation, and speaks of this virgin as a monster—a virgin-widow, and unfit for the work, because she had not had experience in the married life and in the training of children. But the respect for virginity was at that time growing, and other circumstances combined to evoke the new order. To the end of the second century there were no public buildings for Christian worship. The Christians met in private houses, and the tenants of the houses made all the arrangements necessary for the meetings. But when churches began to be built, officials had to look after them, and this duty was assigned to the deacons. In the advance of ascetic ideas, the women sat or stood apart from the men and entered by a separate door. And at this door stood the deaconess to direct the worshippers to their places and to see that all behaved quietly and reverently. This was the great work of women in the Church, and in the end became nearly their only work. But they had also to help the deacons in any service which was deemed more suitable for women. Thus, in baptism, the women were immersed, but it was not seemly that all the preparations for the ceremonial should be made by the men, and the dressing and undressing were committed to the care of the deaconess. At the same rite the deacon anointed only the forehead of the Christian woman with oil; the deaconess then anointed her whole body. The deaconess also undertook the work which the widows had done in carrying messages and ministering to the temporal wants of poor women. "Thou shalt send a woman a deaconess, on account of the imaginations of the bad," is the order given in the Apostolical Constitutions.

The widows had no spiritual function. They were not to teach. How jealous the Church was in this matter is seen from the instructions given to them: "Let the widow," is the commandment in the Constitutions, "mind nothing but to pray for those that give and for the whole Church, and when she is asked anything by any one let her not easily answer, excepting questions concerning the faith and righteousness and hope in God. . . . . But of the remaining doctrines let her not answer anything rashly, lest by saying anything unlearnedly she should make the word to be blasphemed." And the occupation of the widow is summed up in these words, "She is to sit at home, sing, pray, read, watch and fast, speak to God continually in songs and hymns." And if she wishes to go to any one to eat or drink with him, or to receive anything from any one, she must first ask the deacon's consent, and if she acts without first consulting him she is to be punished with fasting or separated on account of her rashness.

The deaconesses also were prohibited from teaching. They were superior to the widows in the liberty of movement which they had, and the widows were enjoined to be obedient to them; but they had no spiritual function, and while there is no doubt that they were ordained for their service, as the widows also were, they had no sacred character, and could perform no priestly office. To take one instance from Tertullian. In discussing the administration of baptism, he states that the bishop has the right of conferring it first of all, then presbyters and deacons, and then if none of these are at hand, a layman might administer, but a woman never. And he appeals to the Apostle Paul. "For how credible would it seem that he who has not permitted a woman even *to learn* with over-boldness, should give a female the power of teaching and baptizing. 'Let them be silent,' he says, 'and at home consult their own husbands.'"

---

* All the translations are taken from Clark's Ante-Nicene Library.

The entire exclusion of women from every sacred function stands in striking contrast with both heathen and heretical practice. In Rome the wife of the Pontifex Maximus took the lead in the worship of Bona Dea, and in the religious rites which specially concerned women. The most honoured priest attached to a particular god in Rome, the Flamen Dialis, must be married, and must resign his office when his wife died, for his wife was also a priestess, and his family were consecrated to the service of the god. And the vestal virgins received every mark of respect that could be bestowed on them, and the amplest liberty. The highest officials made way for them as they passed along the streets, they banqueted with the College of Pontifices, they viewed the games in the company of the Empress, and statues were erected in their honour. The same respect is accorded to women by many of the heretical Christians. Nearly every founder of a sect has a woman to aid him. Simon Magus has his Helena, Montanus his Maximilla, Apelles his Philumene, and so in the case of other sects. One sect deserves special notice for the energy with which it supported the claims of women. It bore various names, such as the Quintiliani, the Pepuziani, the Priscilliani, and the Bread-and-Cheesites, because they celebrated their mysteries with bread and cheese. They gave special thanks to Eve because she first ate of the tree of knowledge. They celebrated the sister of Moses and the four daughters of Philip, because they asserted the right of women to prophesy, that is, to speak in public the message of God. Frequently in their church seven virgins, clothed in white and bearing torches, stood up and addressed the people, and spoke so eloquently that tears of repentance ran down the cheeks of the audience. In this sect women held the place of bishops and elders and deacons as well as men, and they appealed to St. Paul for their practice: for he says, "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female." It is against this sect that Tertullian, or one assuming his name, launches his thunderbolts. "The very women," he says, "of these heretics how wanton they are! For they are bold enough to teach, to dispute, to enact exorcisms, to undertake cures, it may be even to baptize."

Such, then, was the position which woman occupied in the Church in the course of the first three centuries of Christianity. The highest post to which she rose was to be a door-keeper and a message-woman, and even these functions were taken away from her during the Middle Ages. Was there a reason for this? Perhaps we may find some clue to this phenomenon in the conceptions which the Fathers of the Church formed of the nature of woman.

It is one of the curious features of early Christianity that it did not discuss some of those social problems which would naturally have suggested themselves. Thus no objection is taken to slavery, though the Therapeutæ had already denounced it as unlawful and inhuman. Christianity proclaimed a gospel of love, which had no limit but that of the human race. And it applied this gospel to all classes. The Christian slave thus became the brother of all members of the community, received kindness from all and was admitted to equal rights and privileges. But Christianity also enjoined on him submission to the will of his proprietor, urging the belief that man is bound to be content with the position in which he is, to bear patiently all the ills of this life in the certain hope of a glorious future. The marriage laws and customs prevalent throughout the Roman world in the first ages of Christianity ought to have created difficulty, but nothing is said of this difficulty. Thus a Christian slave woman was the property of her master, her children were a source of gain to him, and he took entire control over this matter, as over the breeding of cattle. Yet we do not hear of any discussion in regard to this arrangement, nor of any attempt to rescue the slave woman from the treatment to which she must have been subjected. Again, the Roman law recognized marriages only between citizen and citizen; but a very large number of the early Christians had not the rights of citizenship until the beginning of the third century, and if they made associations of the nature of marriage, their children were deemed illegitimate by the civil law. Probably the Church defied the civil law. It became a maxim that Christians were not to go to law with each other, and the Church established laws, and a jurisdiction of its own. In the case of marriage this was peculiarly necessary, as the marriage of a believer with an unbeliever caused to the former great inconvenience in carrying out his faith, and indeed supplied strong temptations to apostasy. Such marriages were therefore from the first forbidden on pain of expulsion. It is likely, then, that any Christian man and woman were regarded as duly married, notwithstanding the civil law, if they had got the consent of the bishop; and secret connections—that is, connections not first professed in the presence of the Church—were considered akin to vice.

The questions that occupied the Christian mind related rather to the moral character of marriage. These questions were raised first of all by the heretical sects, which applied philosophy to the tenets and practice of the Church. And it is one of the most interesting facts in early Christian history that the Church in combating these sects succeeded in defeating them, but always carried off a large portion of their heretical opinions for its own permanent use. The sects may be divided into two classes. Some affirmed that marriage was unnecessary, that full liberty had been conceded to them of indulging the passions, and that indeed the way to rise to perfection was by a practical acquaintance with all forms of action possible to man. Others held that marriage was immoral, that the flesh was corrupt, that those who sowed to the flesh must reap corruption, and that in the kingdom of God on earth as in heaven there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage. It is difficult to trust all that is said about these heretical sects—for our accounts are derived from the orthodox alone—and in regard to this matter of marriage the orthodox invariably accuse the heterodox of licentiousness. But there was no class of people who ought to have been more careful in their assertions than the orthodox, as they themselves were accused of the vilest crimes. It is one of the most striking facts in all history that in the second century the Christians were universally believed by Pagans to be secret conspirators combined for immoral purposes, and at their trials it was sufficient for a man to confess that he was a Christian to be condemned as a licentious villain. The assertions made in regard to them were that they met in secret, that slaughtering an infant they poured his blood into a cup, and that passing this cup round they all drank of it; that then the lights were extinguished and the men and women proceeded to indiscriminate licentiousness. How could such ideas have arisen? An explanation of this reveals to us marked peculiarities of the early Church in the treatment of women, and may help us to see how the later opinions arose. Christianity came at first in the fervour of an overpowering love, love to God and love to man, irrespective of his race, position, or belief. But this fervour of love directed itself with special force to those who accepted the same faith. They called each other fathers and sons, mothers and daughters, brothers and sisters. They were in the habit of assembling before dawn, or at night, men and women together, in private houses to conduct their worship. The assembly consisted of a strange assortment of characters and grades. The Apostle Paul in writing to the Corinthian Church says to them: "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor cheats, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor plunderers, shall inherit the kingdom of God: and these things were some of you." And there were in the assembly the bond and the free, the rich and the poor, the high and low, but with a large preponderance of the low. It was natural for a heathen to suppose that an assembly, composed, as he would consider it, of the dregs of society, and meeting in hours of darkness, had no good object in view. And the account which they themselves gave of their worship sounded to a Pagan equally contemptible. The Christians affirmed that they worshipped a poor carpenter, a son of despised Galilee, the child of a husbandless mother. Then they spoke of eating a body and drinking blood. But perhaps colour was given to the accusation, most of all by two institutions which have now passed away, except in the case of one or two small sects.

In the days of the first fervour the Christian brethren set up a plan of voluntary socialism, and wished to have all things in common; but the plan did not work, and they had recourse to a systematic relief of the poor. One feature of this relief was what were called Love-feasts. It was not unusual in ancient times for large bodies of men to dine together, and large dinner parties were often made up by each man bringing his contribution to the feast. With some such idea as this the Christians met, men and women together, the rich bringing the supplies, and they all dined together. Probably they did this every day at the earliest period, and some think that these meals constituted the celebration of what is called the Lord's Supper. The love-feasts were unquestionably associated with this institution, but in the course of time they became less frequent, and generally took place after the administration of the Eucharist. They continued till the fifth century, at least, and were often held in the churches, after churches were erected. These dinners were not always scenes of perfect propriety, as St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians shows, and on some occasions intoxication and riotousness prevailed. These feasts went by the name of Loves, or Love-feasts, as we now translate the word. We need not wonder that Pagans should suspect that the Loves were not of the purest.

Then there was another practice, still more foreign to our Christian ideas. There is no command in the New Testament to keep the Sunday, or to stand or sit at singing, or to repeat the Creed or to keep Good Friday or Christmas, or to do a hundred other things about which Christians have wrangled with all earnestness; but there is a commandment five times repeated in the Apostolic Epistles, and indicative of the strong bond of brotherhood which bound Christian brothers and sisters to each other, to this effect: "Salute the brethren with a holy kiss," St. Peter varying the command, "Salute the brethren with a kiss of love." It is likely that at first this kiss was imparted at every meeting, but gradually it became limited to the great sacramental occasions, such as baptism and the Eucharist. At first, too, and for a considerable time, the Christian brothers and sisters kissed each other. It is easy to see that such a practice would give rise to scandalous reports, and there is evidence in the ecclesiastical writers that the early Christians did not always make it a holy kiss, as it should have been. Athenagoras quotes a saying which he attributes to our Lord, and which evidently deals with an abuse of this practice. It is to this effect: "Whoever kisses a second time, because he has found pleasure in it, commits a sin." And Clement of Alexandria thus speaks of the matter: "Love is not tested by a kiss, but by kindly feeling. But there are those that do nothing but make the churches resound with a kiss. For this very thing, the shameless use of the kiss, which ought to be mystic, occasions foul suspicions and evil reports."

These customs prove that considerable freedom prevailed among the earliest Christians, and doubtless sometimes this freedom was abused. In the very first epoch some of the Corinthian Christians sided with a man who committed incest and persisted in it after rebuke, and the Apostle had to exert himself to the utmost to repress the sympathy and the sin. But the accusations, speaking generally, were hideously false and unfounded. They are of some consequence for our purpose, for they must have acted powerfully on the minds of Christians in inducing them to avoid everything that might furnish even the semblance of justification for them.

From a very early date two currents can be traced in the Church—one in the direction of upholding marriage, another in that of despising and rejecting it. No one with the New Testament as his guide could venture to assert that marriage was wrong, and the tradition remained firm in the Church during the Ante-Nicene period that it was unlawful and heretical to forbid marriage. The Apostolic Fathers offer exhortations to wives to love their own husbands truly, and to love all others with no partiality for any one and in all chastity, and to train up their children in the knowledge and fear of God. As time moves on, such exhortations become less frequent, but still marriage is held up as a modified blessing. And Tertullian, whose words in an opposite direction are very strong and numerous, has this passage, "Whence are we to find language adequate to describe the happiness of that marriage which the Church cements and the oblation confirms, and the benediction signs and seals, which angels report and the Father holds as ratified?" And then he describes the joys of the couple: "Together they pray, together prostrate themselves, together perform their fasts, mutually teaching, mutually exhorting, mutually sustaining." But Tertullian, it has to be noticed, is not here insisting on the blessings of marriage, but on the blessedness of a marriage between two believers celebrated in the face of the Church, in contrast with a marriage between a believer and an unbeliever not sanctioned by the Church. The duties of the wife were simple: She had to obey her husband, for he was her head, her lord and superior; she was to fear him, reverence him, and please him alone; she had to cultivate silence; she had to spin and take care of the house, and she ought to stay at home and attend to her children. The only occasions for her going out were when she went to church, or with her husband to visit a sick brother.

The other current of thought which I mentioned ran against marriage, and it was of an ascetic nature. The seeds of it occur in the "Republic" of Plato, and it attached itself to the Pauline conception of flesh. I can explain it best by a reference to food. We take food in order to sustain the body. But various kinds of dainties please the palate, and we may take the food not merely for health, but for the pleasure that it gives. In the first instance we are acting rightly and under an irresistible necessity. In the second instance we are sinning, for we are yielding to a base appetite, the outcome of the flesh. The flesh, its appetites and passions, are the sources of human corruption, and gratification of the flesh is a sin. In like manner the sole object of marriage is that children may be born, and if any other object is sought, it is a gratification of lust, and therefore while marriage is allowable, man may be nearly as licentious in marriage as out of it. These inferences are drawn with the utmost precision by Christian writers of the second and third centuries, and the opinions I have mentioned will be found expressed in numerous passages. But it is easy to see that the mind could not halt in this position. Marriage, even for the sake of children, was a carnal indulgence, and such thinkers could not help feeling that the arrangement of the Creator was not altogether satisfactory. They did not venture on saying this. They did not dare to condemn marriage. But they held that it was much better not to marry at all, that the man or woman who had never married, but remained pure, was a nobler and more exalted being than the man or woman who had married. Of course these ideas did not spring into vogue at once, but gradually forced their way. They were aided by the increasing rigour in the distinction between clerical and lay. The clerical man must possess a peculiar sanctity. A man who aspired to a clerical office in the church must, above all, show control over the lusts and passions of earth, and so refrain from marriage. The lay brother might be unable to free himself from the trammels of earth; the cleric could rise to the throne of heaven only on the wings of virginity. There thus arose a gradation of merit which had its counterpart in the evolution of the world's history. "For the world," says Methodius, "while still unfilled with men, was like a child, and it was necessary that it should first be filled with these, and so grow to manhood. But when hereafter it was colonized from end to end, the race of man spreading to a boundless extent, God no longer allowed man to remain in the same ways, considering how they might now proceed from one point to another and advance nearer to heaven until, having attained to the very greatest and most exalted lesson of virginity, they should reach to perfection, that first they should abandon the intermarriage of brothers and sisters and marry wives from other families, and then that they no longer should have many wives, like brute beasts, as though born for the mere propagation of the species, and then that they should not be adulterers, and then that they should go on to continence, and from continence to virginity, when having trained themselves to despise the flesh, they sail fearlessly into the peaceful haven of immortality." Marriage, according to this writer, was not abolished by Christ, but it was a state of inferiority. "For I think," he makes a virgin say, "I have gathered clearly from the Scriptures that after the Word had brought in virginity, He did not altogether abolish the generation of children; for though the moon may be greater than the stars, the light of the other stars is not destroyed by the moonlight." There thus arose the gradation of virgins, widows, and wives. Tertullian speaks of wives as women of the second degree of modesty who have fallen into wedlock.

The current of thought which I have exhibited displays itself, first of all, in the condemnation of second marriages. The Apostle Paul permitted these, and the Church could not forbid them. In the Pastor of Hermas they are not condemned, but Athenagoras raises his voice against them. "He who deprives himself," he says, "of his first wife, even though she be dead, is a cloaked adulterer." The argument used against them was that God made husband and wife one flesh, and one flesh they remained, even after the death of one of them. If they were one flesh, how could a second woman be added to them? She could not become *one* flesh. Tertullian, diverging from the Catholic to the Montanistic faith, maintained that a second marriage was equal to a marriage with two wives at one time, and therefore forbidden. But whatever their arguments were, at the root of the opinion lay the ascetic tendency of thought. This is seen in Tertullian, who wrote a treatise addressed to his wife, admonishing her not to marry again if he died first. In speaking of the resurrection he says to her: "There will at that day be no resumption of voluptuous disgrace between us;" and in another treatise he remarks: "Let us ponder over our consciousness itself to see how different a man feels himself when he chances to be deprived of his wife. He savours spiritually."

Tertullian, for his age, is exceptional in the strength of his denunciations, and the Church so far adhered to the Apostolic permission as to allow laymen to marry twice.

This antagonism to marriage had a great influence on family life. It is strange how seldom children are mentioned in the Christian writings of the second and third centuries. Almost nothing is said of their training; no efforts are mentioned as being made for their instruction. The Christians had come to the belief that the world had enough of children, and was fully stocked, and that every birth was a cause of sorrow and not of joy. One writer interprets the wail of the infant as he enters the world thus: "Why, O mother, didst thou bring me forth to this life, in which prolongation of life is progress to death? Why hast thou brought me into this troubled world, in which, on being born, swaddling bands are my first experience? Why hast thou delivered me to such a life as this, in which a pitiable youth wastes away before old age, and old age is shunned as under the doom of death? Dreadful, O mother, is the course of life which has death as the goal of the runner. Bitter is the road of life we travel, with the grave as the wayfarer's inn." Tertullian says: "Further reasons for marriage which men allege for themselves arise from anxiety for posterity, and the bitter, bitter pleasure of children. To us this is idle. For why should we be eager to bear children, whom, when we have them, we desire to send before us to glory (in respect, I mean, of the distresses that are now imminent); desirous as we are ourselves to be taken out of this most wicked world and received into the Lord's presence." He describes children as "burdens which are to us most of all unsuitable, as being perilous to faith." And again: "Let the well known burdensomeness of children, especially in our case, suffice to counsel widowhood—children whom men are compelled by laws to have, because no wise man would ever willingly have desired sons." And he exclaims, "A Christian forsooth will seek heirs, disinherited as he is from the entire world."

Such ideas had necessarily a very powerful effect on the place and position of woman and on the conception of her nature. What was that effect? I will attempt to describe it in a few words. I may define man to be a male human being, and woman to be a female human being. They are both human beings, both gifted with reason and conscience, both responsible for their actions, both entitled to the freedom essential to this responsibility, and both capable of the noblest thoughts and deeds. As human beings they are on an equality as to their powers, the differences in individuals resulting from the surroundings and circumstances of spiritual growth. But man is a male and woman is a female, and this distinction exists in Nature for the continuance of the race. Now what the early Christians did was to strike the male out of the definition of man and human being out of the definition of woman. Man was a human being made for the highest and noblest purposes; woman was a female made to serve only one. She was on the earth to inflame the heart of man with every evil passion. She was a fire-ship continually striving to get alongside the male man-of-war to blow him up into pieces. This is the way in which Tertullian addresses women: "Do you not know that each one of you is an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that forbidden tree; you are the first deserter of the divine law; you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image, man. On account of your desert, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die." And the gentle Clement of Alexandria hits her hard when he says: "Nothing disgraceful is proper for man, who is endowed with reason; much less for woman, to whom it brings shame even to reflect of what nature she is." Gregory Thaumaturgus asserts: "Moreover, among all women I sought for chastity proper to them, and I found it in none. And verily, a person may find one man chaste among a thousand, but a woman never." The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs makes a similar statement, and adds: "By means of their adornment they deceive first the minds of men, and they instil poison by the glance of their eye, and then they take them captive by their doings," and therefore "men should guard their senses against every woman." "The angel of God showed me," it says in another passage, "that for ever do women bear rule over king and beggar alike; and from the king they take away his glory, and from the valiant man his strength, and from the beggar even that little which is the stay of his poverty." How, then, were men to treat this frivolous, dress-loving, lust-inspiring creature? Surely the best plan was to shut her up. Her clear duty was to stay at home, and not let herself be seen anywhere. And this duty the Christian writers impress upon her again and again. She is not to go to banquets, where her looks are sure to create evil thoughts in the minds of men who are drinking largely of wine. She is not to go to marriage feasts, where the talk and the songs may border on licentiousness. Of course she is not to wander about the streets in search of sights, nor to frequent the theatre, nor the public baths, nor the spectacles. Does she want exercise? Clement of Alexandria prescribes for her: "She is to exercise herself in spinning and weaving, and superintending the cooking, if necessary." He adds: "Women are with their own hand to fetch from the store what we require; and it is no disgrace for them to apply themselves to the mill. Nor is it a reproach to a wife—housekeeper and helpmeet—to occupy herself in cooking, so that it may be palatable to her husband. And if she shake up the couch, reach drink to her husband when thirsty, set food on the table as neatly as possible, and so give herself exercise tending to sound health, the Instructor will approve of a woman like this." During the only occasions on which she may quit her own house, namely, when visiting the sick or going to church, she must be veiled—not a portion of her face must be seen, and when she is in church she must remain covered. These are the injunctions which occur repeatedly in the Christian writers. Voices were raised against this ascetic treatment, among them that of one Bishop of Rome, but they were drowned in the current of invectives that were directed against woman's love of dress and finery and show. These invectives and discussions on the dress of women and veiling of virgins are numerous. Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Commodian, and the Apostolic Constitutions deal minutely with the subject—all on the idea that woman is a most inflammatory being. Is a woman beautiful? "Natural grace," says Tertullian, "must be obliterated by concealment and negligence, as being dangerous to the glances of the beholder's eyes." Then she must clothe herself from head to foot. In speaking of her going to church, Clement of Alexandria says: "Let her be entirely covered, unless she happen to be at home. For that style of dress is grave and protects from being gazed at. And she will never fall who puts before her face modesty and her shawl; nor will she invite another to fall into sin by uncovering her face. For this is the wish of the Word, since it is becoming for her to pray veiled."

Then she must not adorn herself in any way. "It is not right in God," says Commodian, "that a faithful Christian woman should be adorned." The purpose of clothing is to defend the body against excess of cold and intensity of heat, and the simplest materials are sufficient for this purpose. The Christian woman must therefore bid farewell to embroidery of gold and Indian silks; she is strictly forbidden to wear gold ornaments of any kind, and she is to avoid all dyed clothes, as the dye is unnecessary for health, afflicts greedy eyes, and moreover it is false; for God would have made the sheep purple, if He had wished the woollen clothes to be purple. Strong condemnation is uttered against any attempt to trick out the person. "Head-dresses," says Clement of Alexandria, "and varieties of head-dresses, and elaborate braidings, and infinite modes of dressing the hair, and costly mirrors in which they arrange their costume, are characteristic of women who have lost all shame." And if the adornment of the natural body is thus condemned, the endless variety of artificial contrivances employed by the Roman and Greek ladies is necessarily considered abominable. In regard to the hair, Cyprian addresses virgins thus: "Are sincerity and truth preserved when what is sincere is polluted by adulterous colours, and what is true is changed into a lie by the deceitful dyes of medicaments? Your Lord says, 'Thou canst not make one hair black or white,' and you in order to overcome the word of your Lord, will be more mighty than He, and stain your hair with a daring endeavour, and with profane contempt; with evil presage of the future, make a beginning to yourself already of flame-coloured hair." And he uses equally strong expressions in regard to tinting the eyes. "You cannot see God, since your eyes are not those which God made, but those which the devil has spoiled. You have followed him, you have imitated the red and painted eyes of the serpent. As you are adorned in the fashion of your enemy, with him also you shall burn by-and-by." And he thus sums up the exhortations which he addresses to the virgins: "Let your countenance remain in you incorrupt, your neck unadorned, your figure simple: let not wounds be made in your ears, nor let the precious chain of bracelets and necklaces circle your arms or your neck; let your feet be free from golden bands, your hair stained with no dye, your eyes worthy of beholding God." Notwithstanding all the exhortations which were showered upon the wives and virgins, the Christian writings prove that human nature often had its own way. Both Clement and Cyprian tell dreadful stories of some of the virgins, and in the treatise of Cyprian, from which I have quoted, there are lamentations like this : "For this reason, therefore, the Church frequently mourns over her virgins ; hence she groans at their scandalous and detestable stories ; hence the flower of her virgins is extinguished, the honour and modesty of continency are injured, and all its glory and dignity are profaned." At the same time we ought to do justice to the self-control and perseverance with which many pursued their high ideal —for the ideal was a high one, as the purity aimed at was not corporeal merely, but extended over the whole range of life. "For it would be ridiculous," says one of the virgins in Methodius, "to preserve the lustful members pure, but not the tongue, or to preserve the tongue, but neither the eyesight, the ears nor the hands, or lastly to preserve these pure but not the mind, defiling it with pride and anger."

Such then was the position of women among the early Christians. We have said nothing of Christian legislation, for we have been treating of a period when the legislation was carried on entirely by pagans. But we ought to mention two facts, or two phases of one fact which had a great effect on the destinies of mankind, but especially of woman, and which have found their way into modern legislation. The Roman father had absolute power of life and of death over his children in the primitive times of Rome. Gradually this power slackened, but he retained to the end of heathendom the right to expose his children, and pagan sentiment supported him in such conduct. The infants on their birth might be drowned or exposed to the cold air, or starved or abandoned to wild beasts. In this way deformed and weakly children were left to perish. A very large number of the children who were thus disposed of were girls. Christianity condemned this practice from the first as murder. It went further. It was a question with the ancients at what time the human fœtus became a living being, and many maintained that the soul came to it only when it was born. Tertullian has discussed this subject fully in his Treatise on the Soul. He says : "This view [that the fœtus has no soul] is entertained by the Stoics, along with Aenesidemus, and occasionally by Plato himself, when he tells us that the soul, being quite a separate formation, originating elsewhere and externally to the womb, is inhaled when the new-born infant first draws breath." This was the opinion prevalent among all classes of the Pagan world, and the practice was universal and avowed of killing the fœtus by drugs. But Christianity took the other view, that the soul came at the earliest stage, and maintained that it was equally sinful "to take away a life that is born, or destroy one that is coming to birth." Accordingly the heathen practice was forbidden by the Church. The prohibition made its appearance at an early period in Christianity, for it occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas, written about the beginning of the second century, and we are told that Peter says in the Apocalypse (an apocryphal writing probably of early date) "that abortive infants shall share the better fate : that these are committed to a guardian angel, so that, on receiving knowledge, they may obtain the better abode, having had the same experiences which they would have had, had they been in the body."

This view of the Christians in regard to infanticide would tend largely to increase the number of women in the world, as infant girls were the most frequent victims of the practice. The ascetic tendency, on the other hand, repressed the growth of population. It had also a deteriorating effect on posterity. The less spiritual classes of the people, the laymen, being taught that marriage might be licentious and that it implied an inferior state of sanctity, were rather inclined to neglect matrimony for more loose connections, and it was these persons alone that then peopled the world. It was the survival of the unfittest. The noble men and women, on the other hand, who were dominated by the loftiest aspirations and exhibited the greatest temperance, self-control and virtue, left no children. During this period there is a striking absence of home life in the history of Christians. No son succeeds his father, no wife comforts the wearied student, no daughter soothes the sorrow of the aged bishop. Perhaps this absence of domestic affection, this deficiency in healthy and vigorous offspring, this homelessness, may account in some degree for the striking features of the next century, and especially the prevalent hardness of heart. Then men disputed with the utmost bitterness and ferocity about minute points of doctrine which are now incomprehensible almost to every one, and matters of absolute indifference to this generation, and they pronounced sentence of eternal damnation without the slightest compunction on all who differed from them. Then treatises were written to show why every heretic should be put to death in this life and tortured eternally in the life to come.

And there is scarcely a champion of the faith orthodox or heterodox who was not accused of fearful crimes. If a lesson is to be drawn it surely is that, as with individuals there is no place like home, so with a State, there is no institution like home; that a community can be great only where there are happy, harmonious and virtuous homes, and that homes cannot be happy and harmonious and virtuous unless woman is accorded a worthy place in these homes, with freedom of action, with a consciousness of responsibility, and with the right, unfettered by circumstance or prejudice, to develop all that is best and noblest in her to the utmost perfection.

GIORDANO BRUNO: HIS LIFE AND PHILOSOPHY.

BY C. E. PLUMPTRE.

From *The Westminster Review* (London), August, 1889.

In 1885 an English National Committee in connection with one that was International (begun ten years earlier, we believe) was formed to procure the erection of a monument to Giordano Bruno, as a fitting though tardy tribute of the gratitude due from men of science and philosophy of all nations to the Italian philosopher; and on the 9th of last June this design saw completion. At about 10.30 on that morning, amid an immense crowd, and with the advantage of glorious weather, the procession, consisting of six thousand representatives of the Association, with nineteen hundred and seventy banners and standards, together with about one hundred musicians, wended its way to the Campo dei Fiori, where, on February 17, 1600, Giordano Bruno was burnt alive. Its arrival there was the signal for immense acclamation, while the banners were gradually placed around the monument. At eleven precisely, trumpets were blown to announce that the unveiling of the statue was about to take place. The writer of these pages was not fortunate enough to be present, and therefore cannot speak with the authority of an eye-witness; but, according to Italian newspapers that have been received, the statue is in all respects worthy of the occasion, being one of the finest and most completely finished works of the eminent Italian sculptor, Ettore Ferrari. The philosopher is represented as being buried in profound thought, having in his left hand a book, which he has just ceased to read; while his right hand presses with a sort of nervous tension that which holds the book, the contents of which are evidently the cause of the far-away look in Bruno's eyes. At the base of the monument there are, in *basso relievi*, three representations of Bruno at different periods of his career—viz., one where he is arguing with the doctors of the University of Oxford; another, where his sentence of death is being pronounced upon him; a third, where that sentence is about to be fulfilled in the *Campo dei Fiori*. On another portion of the medallion there are representations of the following apostles of Free-thought: Wickliffe, Huss, Servetus, Palcario, Ramus, Sarpi, Vanini, and Campanella. On the frontage of the basement there is the following inscription by Bovio: *IX. Guigno, MDCCCLXXXIX. A Bruno—il secolo da lui divinato—qui dove il rogo—arse.*

Around this monument were placed about 150 wreaths, one bearing the inscription *Le donne triestine.* At 11.45 the senator Maleschott, the sculptor Ferrari, and Basso, the President of the Committee, ascended a platform, in order to receive certain official documents in connection with the monument; and then amid enthusiastic cries of *Viva Bruno! Viva il Martire del libero pensiero!* the statue was unveiled. A discourse by the orator Bovio completed the ceremony, and at about 12.50 the procession left the Campo dei Fiori in order to do honour to the memory of Garibaldi.

The connection of England with the monument of Bruno has brought the name of the Italian philosopher into unusual prominence in this country, while his works are still of extreme rarity It has occurred therefore to the present writer that a few pages in description of his life and philosophy might not be unwelcome to the readers of this magazine, for their better comprehension of the position Bruno fills in the sixteenth century, and his consequent claims to be remembered by posterity.

For the readier achievement of this object it is necessary to commence with a rapid glance at the various events and influences immediately preceding or succeeding his birth. Few, if any, are entirely independent of their environment; but Bruno, notwithstanding that in many of his scientific speculations he was in advance of his age, was yet, in his personality, peculiarly the product of his own period, not merely by virtue of the interaction between organism and environment common to all, but also and even in greater degree by reaction and rebellion against the prejudices and retrograding influences of his age, which eventually brought upon him the wrath of the Inquisition and led to his death.

Giordano Bruno was born at Nola, in Naples, in 1548; five years after the death of him who had dethroned the earth from the sovereign position she had previously been believed to hold in the solar system—Copernicus. Magellan had been dead barely twenty-seven years, and the circumnavigation of the world and the new ideas resulting therefrom were still in the freshness of novelty. Luther had died in 1546, and the Church was still agitated by the great Reformer's denunciations of her enormities. Of more importance still, unhappily for Bruno, was the sudden renewal of rigour in the Inquisition, consequent probably upon the spread of Lutheranism. Nor must the Italian Renaissance with all her varied influences be left unnoticed. Her ardour for classical learning, her love for art, her practical paganism, all combined to give a hitherto unsurpassed predominance to this present world, with its interests and pursuits; to throw into shadow the vague future world, about which there was, if not explicitly, at least implicitly, considerable scepticism. Strange divergent influences truly! On the one hand, the earth with her interests, her hopes and fears, her ambitions and pursuits—the earth, that is to say, considered relatively to *man*, acquired suddenly a supreme importance. Considered relatively to the *universe*, nay, even to that one portion of the universe called the solar system, she sank with equal suddenness to supreme insignificance—a small globe whirled round with other globes, many of which were larger than herself, in obedience to the power of their sovereign ruler the Sun. One other influence remains to be noticed, most important of all perhaps to Bruno, because of the reactionary antagonism excited within him by it—viz., the unpalatable intermixture of gross hypocrisy and abject superstition, beneath which the larger portion of the religious catholic world were sunk in Italy. It was into this chaos of divergent influences, this strange medley of new beliefs, arising from the ashes of the old, fast dying away or even already dead, that Giordano Bruno, one of the most impressionable of men, was born.

Now let us take a rapid glance at the events closely succeeding Bruno's birth in order to realize more completely the exact position he fills in the history of philosophical thought. In 1561, thirteen years after his own birth, was born Lord Bacon, the founder of the inductive philosophy; three years later, Galileo, a full believer, though a somewhat timid supporter, of the Copernican system. Ten years later than Galileo, John Kepler, the discoverer of the three laws that bear his name, was born. In 1564 our great English dramatist Shakespeare;* in 1632 Benedict Spinoza, and in 1646 Leibnitz. With all these writers Bruno had points in common, and if the influence he exercised upon them was not in every case direct, its indirectness must not let us lose sight of its significance. Nature is a supreme plagiarist, and the thoughts of such few among her sons as are really great she echoes and re-echoes, arraying them in various dresses, sometimes in veritable disguises; heedless apparently whether the name of their true originator survive, so long only as the thoughts themselves shall live. So far as we know, Kepler was the only writer among these that we have enumerated who confessed his indebtedness to Bruno, and he only in private correspondence. But with each of the others, especially Spinoza and Leibnitz, the resemblance is too great to be accidental, though it is quite possible the imitation was unconscious. One man soweth, another reapeth, and the seed expands and grows till it ceases to be recognizable in the fulness of the blossom; while, in their gratitude for the latter, men are apt to forget the greater importance of the former.

Giordano Bruno was born, as we have said, in 1548, his father's profession being that of a soldier. His baptismal name was Filippo, but he exchanged it for the one by which he is now known—Giordano—when he entered the Dominican convent at Naples in his fifteenth year: the very same convent where some three hundred years previously the angelic doctor, Aquinas, had lived and studied. The Dominicans had a reputation for learning. Bruno, from a young child, had a passion for knowledge; and he tells us himself that he selected the Dominican order in preference to others because he thought that in it this passion would have greater chance of gratification. Unhappily for him, his love for knowledge grew by what it fed on. He could not content himself with the answers given to his inquiries by the monks, and from his eighteenth year doubts, especially upon the subject of the Trinity, grew upon him. Yet he so far controlled these doubts that he seems to have spent thirteen years of his life in monastic seclusion without any strong desire to leave. The seclusion was of a modified description, the Dominicans, or Preaching Brothers as they were called, being in the habit of constantly travelling about in pursuit of their religious offices. Bruno's published writings show that his official duties must have at least allowed him sufficient leisure to acquaint himself very widely with the Oriental and European writers of philosophy. In this convent he probably wrote his two earliest works—*i.e.*, the *Candle-Bearer* and the *Noah's Ark.* The latter work has disappeared; the former stands first in Wagner's Leipsic edition of his Italian works; and within the limits of this paper we intend to confine ourselves to an analysis only of such of Bruno's works as are published in Italian.

---

* Many German writers have considered Shakespeare to be largely indebted to Bruno, alike for several of his metaphors and some few of his scientific allusions.

Il Candelaio, or *Candle-Bearer,* is a slight comedy, written in the taste of the period, in which Bruno satirizes Love, Alchemy, and Pedantry. It is not worthy of his later works, but it is interesting to students as a proof of the antagonism he was already beginning to feel at that early age towards the superstitions and pedantries of his contemporaries. The thirteen years spent by Bruno under monastic discipline had been by no means years of uninterrupted peace for him. Doubts of various kinds increased upon him, and the petty tyranny and love of small authority exhibited by monastic officials galled him and made him inwardly rebellious. Twice he received reprimands for some slight breach of discipline. On a third occasion the reprimand was so much more serious that, fearing that he might be cast into prison, he deemed it wiser to take the precaution of escape. He sought refuge in a convent at Rome belonging to his order, but finding that the suit against him was renewed and followed him to Rome, in 1576 he took the serious step of casting off his habit and abandoning the religious life. Taught by experience to dread discovery, he resumed his baptismal name of *Filippo;* and from this time forward we find him passing now under one name and now under another. He wandered about for some days until he arrived at Genoa, where he made a brief sojourn; thence to Noli, Piedmont, Turin, and other towns and cities of Italy, always supporting himself by teaching. In 1579 he found himself at Geneva, where he sought employment as a corrector of proofs in one of the printing-houses, and seems to have fallen into some ill favour with the University of Geneva for having called the ministers of the Church *pedagogues.* We next find him at Lyons and Toulouse, and thence, in 1581, he travelled northwards to Paris. Here he met with better treatment than had previously been his lot. He was made "Professor Extraordinary," and became on terms of warm friendship with Henri III. Three books on the Art of Raymond Lully he published during this French sojourn. The *Candle-Bearer,* though probably written many years earlier, he also now published. In 1583 Bruno went to England, and the two years spent there seem to have been the happiest years of his adult life. He lived in the house of Castelnau de Mauvissière, and dedicated four of his works to him. Fulke Greville, Philip Sidney, and other men of learning and knightly worth were among his friends. In June of this year he was allowed to hold a public disputation before the Chancellor of Oxford upon the Copernican theory, but apparently there was little agreement between him and his audience, and he records with some bitterness that he hardly knows which ought to be condemned the most, the beer-drinking propensities of the undergraduates or the hopeless pedantry of their seniors.

The *Cena delle Ceneri* (Supper of Ashes), or Evening Conversations on Ash Wednesday, stands second in Wagner's edition of Bruno's Italian works, and is the first bearing a dedication to the French Ambassador, Castelnau de Mauvissière. It consists of five dialogues between Smitho an Englishman, Teofilo a philosopher (presumably Bruno himself), Prudenzio a pedant, and Frulla, a character introduced probably for diversion, whose chief employment consists in making jests that are more or less unseemly. These dialogues are concerned principally with two subjects: a lively description of his life in London, and an investigation into the Copernican theory, which Bruno cannot help feeling is strangely divergent from the Mosaic account of creation. He is careful, however, to point out that the philosophy of Copernicus is favoured in many passages of the Book of Job, for which book he had an immense admiration, describing it in his fourth dialogue as "one of the most singular that can be read, full of all good theology, physics, and morality, abounding with wisest discourses, which Moses added as a sacrament to the book of his Laws."

It is in the *Cena delle Ceneri* that Bruno first displays his true attitude towards Aristotelianism, and more especially towards that scholasticism which, while sheltering itself under the name of Aristotle, totally ignored the true method of the master himself. To understand Bruno's denunciation of Aristotelianism, we must remember that under the influence of scholasticism the great Stagirite had been endowed with an infallibility which assuredly he would not have claimed for himself. The test of any new doctrine, any scientific discovery, was held to be found not in experiment, nor in argument, but in the support it might or might not receive from the works of Aristotle. Nay, the mere omission of reference in Aristotle to any subject was considered sufficient negative proof to condemn it, or at least to exclude it from all further investigation. And Bruno seemed at times to be excited to an absolute hatred to a philosophical bigotry and intolerance that threatened to impede all further knowledge as much as religious intolerance itself. There is an anecdote told, for instance, of a certain student who, having detected spots on the sun, communicated his discovery to a priest. "My son," replied the priest, "I have read Aristotle many times, and I can assure you that there is nothing of the kind mentioned by him. Go in peace, and learn to convince yourself that the spots which you have seen are in your own eyes, and not in the sun." This pseudo-Aristotelianism served indeed as a sort of convenient cloak to religious bigotry, for its scientific support was chiefly claimed as a verification of the Mosaic account of creation. Bruno had no wish unduly to decry Aristotle ; but he did not disguise his opinion that reverence for him, and indeed for all authority, considered as mere authority, carried to a superstitious extent, must be a hindrance to all true progress ; and in this *Cena*, endeavouring to relegate Aristotle to his true place in the history of thought, Bruno pointed to a fact that is even now hardly sufficiently reognized—viz., that what are called the *olden* ages, the *ancient* times, are in reality the *early* ages, the *youthful* times ; and, conversely, that what are spoken of as the recent and modern times, are in reality the older. The world, for instance—now well-nigh on its twentieth century—is older by more than four hundred years than when Bruno pointed out this great truth ; and he was led to the statement because he had been rebuked for his presumption in venturing to question the authority of one who had lived so many years earlier than himself as Aristotle, the inference drawn being that because Aristotle had lived so many years earlier, therefore must his opinion be of proportionately greater value. Bruno rightly perceived that the exact converse of this is the case ; and though some of his works, taken as a whole, are finer than the *Cena delle Ceneri*, we doubt whether any of them contain a truth of greater value than where he thus relegates authority to its rightful place.

The *Della Causa, Principio et Uno* is a sort of continuation of, or at all events has a certain connection with, the *Cena delle Ceneri*. The scene is still laid in England, and Teofilo again forms the chief among the *dramatis personæ*. Smitho's place is filled by Dicsono Arelio ; the pedant is called Poliinnio, while Gervasio is substituted for Frulla. It is dedicated to "Michel di Castelnau, Signor di Mauvissiero," the distinguished French Ambassador to England, Castelnau de la Mauvissière.

It is in the *Della Causa Principio et Uno* that Bruno's relationship to Spinoza is best to be seen.

"What is the efficient cause ?" asks Dicsono.

"I affirm," answers Teofilo, "the physical universal efficient to be the universal intellect. This is that One which fills the great whole, which illuminates the universe, which directs Nature to produce its species in the way which is most suitable. This, I understand, to be that One in all things which produces diverse configurations and works out divers faculties."

"Will you distinguish what you mean by extrinsic cause and intrinsic cause ?" asks Dicsono.

And in reply Teofilo defines his *causa intrinseca* and *causa extrinseca* very much as Spinoza his *Natura Naturans* and *Natura Naturata*, Nature acting and Nature acted on. Or, to use more modern phraseology, both would affirm the One Sole Cause and Principle of Things, to be the *noumenon*, of which the multiform modes of existence we see around us are but *phenomena*.

Yet the work most necessary for us to study in order to comprehend Bruno's exact place in modern science and philosophy is his *De l'Infinito Universo e Mondi ;* and it is to an analysis of this work, therefore, that we purpose to devote most space.

We must bear in mind that in the latter half of the sixteenth century the Copernican theory was still in the freshness of novelty, and that it had come upon Bruno as a sort of revelation. It had more than a scientific value for him, though he would have been the last to under-estimate its scientific importance. But he was of a keenly imaginative bent, possessing that kind of imagination—what Wordsworth calls "the vision and the faculty divine"—which achieves discoveries by a sort of intuition. He pondered and brooded over this new revelation, this revulsion of thought, which relegated the earth from her position of sovereignty to that of helpless submission, from the place of ruler to ruled, till he seemed penetrated by it. He examined it in all its bearings, gathering with each examination increased consciousness of its importance, till suddenly, and as it were by a leap, its full significance burst upon him. What if this solar system of ours was but one system among myriads? What if the position our earth fills towards the sun was but the same as that sun himself fills in a still larger system? As with the Copernican theory, this new conception had for him more than a scientific value. It came as a sort of religion to his poetic impressionable soul, filling him with that mysterious consciousness of the Infinite as sublime as it is bewildering. And from thenceforth Bruno became the apostle of the Sidereal system. If the modern conception of the Solar system rightly bears the name of "Copernican," no less rightly, it seems to us, should the modern conception of the Sidereal system bear the name of "Brunœan," or possibly, as Bruno would have preferred the nomenclature, the "Nolan" theory. Yet owing to some strange irony of fate, Copernicus, dying peaceably in his bed at an advanced age, unconscious it is true of his own future greatness, yet suffering few of the penalties of greatness, has been long associated with a distinctly new epoch in astronomical discovery. Bruno, on the contrary, who paid the penalty of his greatness by a long imprisonment and a cruel death, has been until lately almost ignored, and even now we rarely find him mentioned in any history of modern astronomy. Yet as much greater as is the discovery of the sidereal system than that of the solar system, so much greater, it seems to us, should Bruno be considered than Copernicus.

Yet Bruno, while possessed of a longing almost unsurpassed to penetrate the mystery of the universe that presses upon most thoughtful minds, was comparatively but little oppressed with what the Germans have called *Welt-Schmerz* (*i.e.*, world-sorrow), or that consciousness of the burden and mystery of human suffering which has afflicted so many thinkers from the writer of Ecclesiastes to Schopenhauer and Leopardi. And in this as in other ways he shows himself to be a child of his own period. In the sixteenth century man himself had not come to be regarded as the proper study of man, but rather the place on which he dwelt, its relationship to the sun, and finally the position filled by it in space. Consequently, it was the infinite glory of the universe that filled the mind of Bruno; the consideration of the majesty and omniscience of the One Sole Cause of all things that animated him till he was raised, as it were, above the contemplation of earthly things, and seemed hardly in touch with humanity. Whensoever he did descend from this high pedestal, it was in a mood that was slighter and altogether less worthy. The pedantries and stupidities of his contemporaries were derided by him with light banter, sometimes with scathing satire, but too often couched in language according with the coarse taste of the day. All his nobler, all his more fervent, thoughts were given to the contemplation of things celestial. In this wise he fully deserved with Spinoza the name of "God-intoxicated." The whence and how of the Cosmos in all its unrealizable grandeur penetrated him with a sort of irresistible fascination, but the why and wherefore of sin and misery but little disturbed him; nor does he seem to have asked himself how the superstitions he so contemptuously derided should have been allowed to take root and flourish. This is the more remarkable, because Bruno was no ascetic; still less cynical or morose. He was bright-hearted and, we should judge, eminently lovable—at once grateful for kindness and appreciative of goodness; and therefore to a certain extent must have belonged to that order of mind called sympathetic. Yet that indignation against wrongdoing, that yearning and compassion called out by suffering almost inseparable from sympathetic natures, he seems to have felt but little. And the interpretation is, we think, that he gave to humanity but his passing moods; to Divine Wisdom his soul and passion. We use the word *passion* advisedly, because Bruno was very fond of comparing his passion for wisdom with that of the lover's yearning for his mistress.

The *Infinito Universo e Mondi* was dedicated to Castelnau, in a somewhat lengthy preface descriptive of his book, which has been translated by Toland; though of the work itself, so far as we are aware, there is no English translation as yet.

Bruno commences his preface by complaining of the treatment bestowed upon him for his devotion to the study of Nature, for the contempt he feels towards popular authority, and for his love towards "one particular lady. It is for her that I am free in servitude, content in pain, rich in necessity, and alive in death. Hence it is even from my passion for this beauty that, as being weary, I draw not back my feet from the difficult road, nor, as bewildered, divert my gaze from the divine object. . . . . If I err, I am far from thinking I do; and whether I speak or write, I dispute not for victory (for I look upon all reputation and conquest to be hateful to God, to be vile and dishonourable without truth), but it is for the love of true wisdom, and by the studious admiration of this mistress, that I fatigue and torment myself." Then, after describing the leading arguments in his book, he breaks forth into a rapturous eulogy upon the new point of view it presents to the reader, comparing it with the old received notion of the position of the earth, thus: "This is that philosophy which opens the senses, which enlarges the understanding, and satisfies the mind. Look to it now, gentlemen astrologers, with your humble servants the natural philosophers, and see to what use you can put your circles that are described by the imaginary nine movable spheres, in which you so imprison your brains that you seem to me like so many parrots in their cages, hopping and dancing from one perch to another, yet always winding and turning within the same wires. But be it known unto you that so great an emperor hath not so narrow a palace, or so low a tribunal, but rather an infinite representation of an infinite original, and a spectacle befitting the excellency and eminence of Him that can neither be imagined, nor conceived, nor comprehended. Thus the excellency of God is magnified and the grandeur of His empire made manifest, since He is glorified not in one, but in numberless suns; not in one earth or world, but in ten hundred thousand, in infinite globes." The conclusion of this dedication shows Bruno to be fully conscious of the importance of his work, and of himself as its writer, notwithstanding the little recognition he has as yet received; and he bids Castelnau look upon him as one "whom you are not to entertain among your domestics as having need of him, but as a person having need of you for so many and great purposes as you here see. Consider that for having such numbers at hand bound to serve you, you are thereby nothing different from farmers, bankers, or merchants; but that for having a man deserving to be by you encouraged, protected, and assisted, you are in reality (what you have always shown yourself to be) like unto magnanimous princes, heroes, and gods, who have ordained such as you for the defence of their friends."

The *Infinito Universo e Mondi* consists of five dialogues, the *dramatis personæ* being Elpino, an upholder of Aristotle's opinions; Filoteo, occasionally called Teofilo, evidently Bruno himself; and two minor personages, introduced more or less for the sake of diversion. In the fifth dialogue a new character is introduced, who is called Albertino, and who is represented as one having sufficient ability and freedom from prejudice to understand the new conception of the universe, notwithstanding that by education he is an Aristotelian.

The first dialogue is chiefly devoted to a dissertation on the unreliability of the senses, Bruno asserting that it is only by careful comparison of one object with another that even a proximate knowledge can be attained. From this he proceeds to the question of the infinity of the universe, and in clear, concise language, almost worthy of Herbert Spencer himself, shows what Mr. Spencer has so ably demonstrated in his *First Principles*, that a finite universe is a contradiction in terms. By no manner of possibility are we able to conceive the universe bounded by nothing. It is true that to our finite intellect an infinite universe is also incapable of clear presentation to our thoughts, but (as it seems to us) the difference between these two difficulties is one not of degree, but of kind. The one difficulty is simply that the finite cannot grasp the Infinite; the other involves what any finite mind, if he will but rightly consider, must see to be a glaring contradiction in itself. Finite means *bounded*, and bounded implies bounded by *something*, and thus by no possibility can we conceive space bounded; for that by which space is bounded must itself lie in space. In clear, precise language Bruno shows that we are perfectly able to conceive finite globes, but not finite space: "Io dico l'universo tutto infinito, per che non ha margine, termine, nè superficie; dico, l'universo non essere totalmente infinito, per che ciascuna parte, che di quello possiamo prendere, è finita, e de' mondi innumerabili, che contiene, ciascuno è finito. Io dico Dio tutto infinito, per che da sè esclude ogni termine, etogni suo attributo e Uno et Infinito; e dico Dio totalmente infinito, per che tutto lui è in tutto il mondo et in ciascuna sua parte infinitamente e totalmente: al contrario de l'infinità de l'universo, la quale è totalmente in tutto, e non in queste parti, se pur, riferendosi a l'infinito, possono esser chiamate parti, che noi possiamo comprendere in quello."

From the consideration of an infinite universe Bruno proceeds to the scientific conception of infinite motion. Each world he maintains to be in unceasing motion; this motion is intrinsic, and proceeds from no external pressure, yet he thinks that there must be an infinite power acting throughout the entire universe at once both "extensively and intensively."

The same subject is continued in the second dialogue, and very many of the same arguments; but Bruno imports into this dialogue a discussion upon the proof of the infinity of the universe afforded by gravity and levity; Elpino repeating all the arguments of Aristotle, while Fileteo examines and refutes them.

The third dialogue deals with the shape and figure of the spheres and the number and diversity of the heavens, Bruno declaring that, so far from "Heaven" being one, there are an infinite number of "heavens," taking that word in its usual signification; for as this earth has its heaven, which is that region of space wherein it moves and performs its course, so has each and every other of the innumerable worlds in the universe its own particular heaven. In one sense only can we affirm heaven to be one, and that is, as being the general space which contains infinite worlds. Then he shows that every star has its own particular motion. He explains the difference between stars or suns, and planets, and shows that the former have light in themselves, and the latter but reflected light. He examines also the doctrine of Cusanus about the probability of these other worlds being inhabited, inclining to such a belief himself. The fourth dialogue repeats what has been said in former dialogues as to the infinity of worlds, their formation and motion, and a further explanation is given of gravity and levity. How thoroughly Bruno grasped and realized the office, so omnipresent and unceasing, that gravity fills throughout the entire universe, from the hugest system of stars to the smallest object, is shown by his apt illustration of a stone, which, he argues, were it placed between two worlds of equal size, and at an exactly similar distance from each, would remain motionless, being equally balanced in space by the gravity that in equal proportions belongs to each world. He shows that there are worlds of all sizes, and systems of various degrees of complexity; that the universe has "no margin, no extremity;" and that therefore, though each globe has its own centre, and has a relation to the common centre of the whole, we cannot discover a centre in a universe which is infinite. Indeed, he might with perfect justice in support of his position have described his conception of the universe in that fine phrase familiar to most of us as "having its circumference nowhere and its centre everywhere." In this dialogue he also touches upon the nature of comets, which he seems to think has a certain resemblance to that of planets.

The fifth dialogue is principally devoted to twelve objections, which Albertino, the new interlocutor, brings to Bruno's doctrine of the plurality of worlds. Bruno's conviction of the greater sublimity of his own conception of the Cosmos, is best to be seen in the preface to his *Infinito Universo e Mondi*, to which we have already alluded. We will quote the following passages from it because they will serve to show not only his ardour and enthusiasm for this new conception, but also the singular extent to which he seemed elevated by it from all touch with human hopes and fears:—

"These are the doubts and motives, the solution of which we have said enough to expose the intimate and radical errors of the common philosophy, and to show the weight and importance of our own. Here you will learn the reason why we should not fear that any part of this universe should fall or fly off, that the least particle should be lost in empty space, or be truly annihilated. Here you will find the reason of the vicissitude and mutation of all things, whereby nothing is really ill that befalls from which we may not escape, nor good to which we cannot run; since in this infinite field, in spite of this constant mutation, the substance itself remains ever the same. From this contemplation, if we will but duly observe, it will follow that no unexpected accident, whether of grief or pain, should disturb us, nor any hope nor good fortune unduly elate us, whence we shall have the true way to perfect morality and thus may become great enough to be able to despise such things as are greatly esteemed by men of small or childish minds, and to be able to work out for themselves the divine laws engraven upon our hearts. For we shall know that it is no more difficult to fly from hence up to heaven than to fly from heaven back again to earth, since ascending thither and descending hither are all one. For we are no more surrounded by other globes than they are by our globe, nor are they more central to us than we to them; neither do they press upon the stars more than we, as they no less than we are comprehended by the same sky. Behold us then free from envy! Behold us delivered from the vain anxiety and foolish care of desiring to enjoy that good afar off which we may possess close at hand and near. Behold us freed from that greater terror that they should fall upon us any more than we should hope that we might fall upon them, since our globe, like the others, is sustained by the same infinite ether (*aria*); thus this our animal (*animale**) freely runs through that part of space confined to his own region, as the other planets do to theirs. Did we but consider and comprehend all this, oh! to what greater consideration and comprehension might we not be carried! since by means of this science we should be sure to obtain happiness, which in other sciences is sought after in vain.

"This is that philosophy . . . . which leads man to the only true beatitude possible to him as man, for it delivers him from solicitous pursuit of pleasure and blind dread of misery, bidding him enjoy the present, neither to dread nor to look forward with hope to the future, since that same Providence or Fate or Fortune which causes all vicissitudes that befall us, will let us know no more of the one than of the other, though at first sight it is natural to feel doubtful and perplexed. Yet if we will consider carefully the substance and being of that into which we are mutable, we shall find that there is no death attending us, nor any other real substance, since nothing is substantially diminished; but everything as it courses through infinite space, simply changes its form. Thus everything being subjected to a good and most efficient cause, we should believe and hope that as everything proceeds from good, so must the whole be good, and for a good purpose. The contrary appears only to those who apprehend but the present, as the beauty of an edifice is not manifest to one that sees but a small portion, as a stone, or plastering, or part of a wall; but appears great to him who sees the whole and has leisure to make himself familiar with every part. We fear not therefore that what is accumulated in this world, by the vehemence of some wandering spirit, or the wrath of some thundering Jove, should be dispersed from this tomb or cupola of the sky, or be dissolved into powder beyond the starry firmament; nor that the nature of things can otherwise come to be annihilated in substance, than as it seems to our eyes that the air contained in the cavity of a bubble becomes nothing when it bursts; because we know that in a world in which everything succeeds another, there is no profoundest depth into which, as by the hand of an artificer, things are dissolved irreparably into nothing. There are no ends, limits, margins, or walls that defraud or subtract the infinite abundance of things. Thus the earth is fertile, and so is the sea; thus the perpetual brightness of the sun; eternal fuel sustaining those devouring fires, and moisture the exhausted seas, from the infinite and ever renewed sustaining matter. Thus Democritus and Epicurus, who asserted the infinity of things, renewing and restoring, were nearer to a right conception than those who imagined the reverse." The Introduction concludes with a fine sonnet, from which we have not space to quote here.

We have dealt at some length upon the *Infinito Universo e Mondi*, because of all Bruno's Italian works it best shows how far he anticipated modern science. The Latin works, *De Monade, De Immenso,* are substantially a reproduction of *Della Causa* and *Della Infinito,* not merely repeating the same philosophical and scientific conceptions, but portraying the same condition of mind to which we have already alluded: an intense mystical rapture which raises him entirely above fear of death or earthly misfortune, and makes us feel that the subjective happiness within him must almost have atoned for the strokes of his untoward fortune. His relationship to Leibnitz is best seen in his work, *De Monade.*

We need not dwell at any length upon the two works of Bruno, next in order in Wagner's edition, *Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante* and the *Cabala del Cavallo Pegaseo,* the first of which is an extremely able though somewhat heavy allegory, written in the style of the period. It is dedicated to Sidney, and satirizes the various vices of the day under the guise of astronomical personifications. The *Cavallo* satirizes that piety which refuses all honest inquiry and original investigation. To the *Cavallo* is added, as a sort of continuation, a very short work of only five pages, called *Asino Cillenico.* Indeed the "ass," as a representation of human stupidity, was a favourite metaphor with Bruno, and meets us in many of his works. The next and last work in Wagner's edition, is that called *Gli Eroici Furori*—a work of much beauty, and interesting to us not so much for any philosophical or scientific conception it puts forth, but rather as an autobiographical revelation descriptive of that mystical rapture to which we have already alluded.

The *Eroici Furori* is dedicated to Philip Sidney in a somewhat lengthy preface, in which Bruno draws a comparison between the attractions of sensual love and those of the divine Muse which enchains himself. At the end of the preface, as if moved by some compunction lest he may have spoken too contemptuously of women, there is a sonnet written in praise of the beautiful and virtuous women he met with while in England. The work itself is in two parts, each part being divided into five dialogues.* It is freely interspersed with numerous sonnets, opening with one invoking his muse to come to his aid and inspire him with all high thoughts. Many of these sonnets are of extreme beauty. *Eroici Furori*, or Heroic Love, really means with Bruno an intense longing for divine wisdom and love for spiritual beauty. And it is impossible to read the sonnets of which this work is so largely composed without apprehending the sublime inward vision by which he is inspired. He conceives himself freed from the trammels of the flesh, unclogged even by the power of gravity, breasting the air at will; bounding through space from world to world, from system to system, gaining with each progress fuller knowledge of the One Sole Cause of All. For if Infinite Space is illimitable, Infinite Being must surely be without limits also. His religious standpoint was, therefore, distinctly pantheism. It is sometimes said that there is but a step between atheism and pantheism, and logically perhaps this is so; but emotionally the difference is immense, and religious feeling pertains to the emotion. The atheist believes that there is no God but Nature; the pantheist conceives the whole of Nature to be but a manifestation of God. No one can read this *Eroici Furori* without seeing that it is a work distinctly of religious aspiration. Nay, if we except such of his writings as are satires we may describe all Bruno's works to be of this nature. His spiritual ideal and divine object receives, it is true, different names at different times. Now she is "Sophia or Wisdom," now his "one beloved lady," now "mia diva;" but through all her various guises we are made to feel with Bruno himself that all these attempts at nomenclature are but provisional and inadequate definitions of that which is beyond human conception, much less human definition.

---

* Bruno frequently describes worlds as if he considered them to be animated beings; the larger he calls *divinities*, the smaller *animals.*

We have sometimes thought that in their essential natures the poet Shelley has more in common with Bruno than any other writer with whom we are acquainted. In each there is the same spiritual exaltation, the same intensity of religious feeling, strangely contrasted with absence of belief in religious dogma; there is the same hatred of shams and hypocrisy; the same passionate ardour for truth; there is even the same contempt for pedagogues, and dislike to university life. But in Shelley was developed a far larger amount of feeling for the woes and sins of humanity, which makes him at once greater and lesser than Bruno. It made his teaching too iconoclastic and destructive, while that of Bruno was mainly constructive. Shelley warred against all religion, Bruno against the shams and make-believes of religion. Shelley hated both legal and religious restraint, all that interfered with the freedom, and, as he thought, happiness of man. Bruno only wanted sufficient freedom to worship in his own way the divine Mistress which enchained him; in the service of whom and in the proclamation of whose beauty he could be as iconoclastic as Shelley himself; and for her he was ready to sacrifice both life and liberty. But all religion that was honestly held—so long as it interfered not with a belief in the infinity of worlds—had nothing but consideration from him. He declares that though there is but one Truth, there are many ways leading to that one Truth. And consistently with this declaration he was on terms of warm affection with the Catholic Castelnau, equally with the Protestant Sidney. He was one of the very few in his day capable of admiring persons of an alien religion, so long only as that religion was honestly held. Thus intellectually he dissented more from the Lutheran doctrine than any other, because of the preference it professed for faith rather than works, declaring that such a doctrine partook of the nature of *deform* rather than *reform*; yet for the Lutherans, considered as a body, he had much respect, simply because he could see that they were genuine in their beliefs. Thus where Shelley would probably have held that religion was made for man and not man for religion, and that all religions were only to be considered good in so far as they made man better, Bruno held that the worship of the Infinite One should be a supreme object with man, and in his *Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast* he traces the resemblance that there is in all religions, and shows that beneath superficial diversities the aim and object of all is essentially the same—viz., the contemplation and worship of the Ineffable. Thus, the improvement of man was to Shelley what the adoration of God was to Bruno; yet even here Bruno so far agrees with Shelley that in his *Spaccio* and elsewhere he pronounces those laws to be best, whether secular or religious, that give to the best actions the best encouragement. The slight difference between them lies not so much in the essential natures of the two men as in the different periods in which each was born. The *Zeit-Geist* of Bruno's day was the new revelation of the solar system and of the movement and position of the earth. Humanity, its rights and duties and privileges, filled the foremost place of thought in the time of Shelley; and it was natural that, living when he did, the woes and miseries of mankind should have pressed themselves upon him so acutely. Yet in spite of this diversity of aims, we can scarcely read the works of the two poets consecutively and with care without perceiving the very real similarity there is between them. Let him who has just risen from a study of Bruno's *Infinito Universo e Mondi* begin the *Adonais* of Shelley, or his *Alastor,* and he will see that the spiritual conception in each is almost identical. Or let him study certain of the sonnets in the *Eroici Furori,* and fully realize Bruno's imaginative representation of himself, freed from all earthly trammels, breasting space and absorbed in the contemplation of the Infinite around him, and then read *Queen Mab,* whom Shelley represents as led by a Fairy or Spirit, seated in a wondrous chariot, which seemed to fly

---

* The first part has been translated into English by L. Williams, under the title of *The Heroic Enthusiasts*.

> "Through the midst of an immense concave
> Radiant with million constellations, tinged
> With shades of infinite colour,
> And semi-circled with a belt,
> Flashing incessant meteors.

* * * * *

> "The magic car moved on,
> Earth's distant orb appeared
> The smallest light that twinkles in the heaven;
> While round the chariot's way
> Innumerable systems widely rolled,
> And countless spheres diffused
> An ever varying glory.

* * * * *

> "Spirit of Nature! here,
> In this interminable wilderness
> Of worlds, at whose immensity
> Even soaring fancy staggers—
> Here is thy fitting temple.
> Yet not the lightest leaf
> That quivers to the passing breeze
> Is less instinct with thee;
> Yet not the meanest worm
> That lurks in graves and fattens on the dead
> Less shares thy eternal breath.
> Spirit of Nature! thou!
> Imperishable as this scene,
> Here is thy fitting temple."

No one, we think, could read the works of the two poets even superficially without seeing the very real resemblance in the spirit pervading them; no one could read a little more deeply without perceiving also the difference engrafted on the similarity by the spirit of the time. It is enough for Bruno to hope that infinite worlds are filled with inhabitants capable of worshipping the Ineffable. Shelley dreads lest these inhabitants may suffer from the woes and sorrows that afflict humanity.

We must return from this digression to that point where we last left off in our sketch of Bruno's travels.

In 1585 Bruno left England for a second visit to Paris; thence to Mayence, Marburg, and Wittenberg. He received better treatment in Wittenberg than in his other resting-places, and consequently remained there two years. On March 8, 1588, he pronounced a grateful valedictory oration before the University of Wittenberg; unfortunately too long for quotation here. From Wittenberg he went to Prague; thence to Helmstedt, where he met with a fate now almost habitual to him—viz., attracting warm admiration and favour from the reigning princes, while incurring virulence from the theologians and pedagogues. Boethius, the Pastor of the Evangelical Church, solemnly excommunicated him.

Frankfort was Bruno's next resting-place. It was the centre of the German book trade; and Italian booksellers, and indeed booksellers from various parts of Europe, attended the Easter and Michaelmas fairs held at Frankfort. Bruno would have liked to find a lodging in the house of the great printer, Wechel; but he was gradually becoming a marked character, and Wechel evidently feared to run the risk of sheltering him. Somewhat strangely he found ready admission in the convent of the Carmelites. It was here in Frankfort that Bruno sent his four Latin works, *On the Threefold Minimum, On the Monad, On Immensity,* and *On the Composition of Images, Signs and Ideas,* to press. Early in 1591 Bruno suddenly left Frankfort, and had the imprudence to revisit Italy. His country had always been warmly beloved by him, and he was probably only too glad to avail himself of a slight incident as an excuse for revisiting it. This incident was nothing more important than the fact that a book written by him—possibly a work alluding to the art of Lully—had fallen into the hands of Ciotto, a somewhat eminent Venetian bookseller, who had shown it to a young Italian nobleman belonging to the distinguished family of the Mocenigos. Giovanni or Zuane Mocenigo shared to a certain extent the love of learning common to his family, and probably possessed also the love of the marvellous, and a leaning to the occult so prevalent in his age. A glance at the book seems to have inspired him with the hope that Bruno would be able to impart to him much that he was desirous to learn; and Bruno received in consequence the flattering intimation that Mocenigo was anxious to become acquainted with him. Still, this little incident, though it probably formed an additional reason for Bruno's sudden departure from Frankfort, could scarcely have been the true cause, since he was eight months on his road—staying at Zurich and Padua—before visiting Venice. From the moment that he entered Venice fate was preparing her toils for him. He first took a lodging, so as to instruct Mocenigo, though he still frequently returned to Padua in order to give private lessons to certain German students residing at the University. Then in March, 1592, he became an intimate of Mocenigo's house on the Grand Canal. From that time his fate was sealed. Mocenigo became at first disappointed, and afterwards irritated, that Bruno did not impart that occult knowledge so ardently desired by him. Bruno very probably, with his known imprudence, did not disguise the contempt he felt towards the superstitions and pedantries of his age. Then Mocenigo, unable to divest himself of his preconceived conception of Bruno's acquaintance with occult matters, threatened him with the Inquisition if he would not impart what Mocenigo still thought he was only keeping back from some motives of his own. Bruno answered contemptuously that he "had no fear of the Inquisition; yet, as he seemed to be giving no satisfaction to his patron, he was quite willing to pack up his things and leave." While the unfortunate Neapolitan was preparing for his departure, his patron, probably dreading that Bruno might spread abroad more of his superstitious feelings than he cared to have publicly made known, secretly betrayed him to the Inquisition. His denunciations are in the form of three letters, too lengthy to be given here; but they will be found in Berti's *Documenti intorno a Giordano Bruno,** and they are dated severally May 23, 25, and 29, 1592. In them Mocenigo accuses Bruno of being possessed of the devil, of being an enemy to Christ, and of various philosophical and heretical opinions, some of which he probably held, but the majority of which were undoubtedly perversions. Thus, where he makes Bruno lament that "the Church in these days does not deal with men as the Apostles dealt, for they converted the people by preaching and good example, but now the Catholic Church takes men by violence and not by love," Mocenigo was probably quite accurate in his statement. Again, when he represents Bruno as holding the Catholic faith to be higher than all other forms of dogmatic beliefs, he is again probably correct. Bruno did not hold very strongly to any stated form of faith, thinking that a good life was of far more importance than any mere set of doctrines; yet he never entirely shook himself free from a certain affection towards the religion long endeared to him by ancestry and the environment of his childhood, unsparing though he was towards the hypocrisies of the religious world during his later life. But when Mocenigo represented Bruno as denouncing Christ as *un tristo*, a sorry or contemptible fellow, assuredly he accused him of opinions which he never uttered, and which he indignantly repudiated.

On the 24th of May Bruno was conveyed to the prisons of the Holy Office, and on the following day Mocenigo took his oath of confirmation before the Father Inquisitor. The trial at once began. Ciotto and another Venetian bookseller, Bertano, were both examined, the one on the 26th, the other on the 29th of May. Both agreed in saying that Bruno had never uttered a word in their presence against Christianity or the Catholic Church. Then Bruno himself was examined, detailing at length the circumstances of his life. When asked the question, "What things are necessary to salvation?" he answered emphatically, "Faith, hope, and charity." Asked if he had any enemy, he replied bitterly, "My only enemy is Ser Giovanni Mocenigo, who threatened my life and my honour, and that continually." Yet it is probable that the numerous onslaughts made by Bruno upon pedagogues and theologians in different parts of Europe, together with his praise of various Lutheran sovereigns, may, unconsciously to himself, have brought him many enemies. On the 23rd of June Andrea Morosini, the distinguished historian, was called upon to give his evidence. Bruno had been in the habit of attending his literary and political assemblies. Upon being asked his opinion of Bruno's religious belief, Morosini answered that in his hearing Bruno had never touched upon religion, and added that had he thought him other than a good Catholic he would never have permitted him to enter his assemblies.

Etiquette between Venice and Rome caused a certain delay in Bruno's trial, but on the 7th January, 1593, he was officially delivered over to the Inquisition at Rome, and on the 27th entered those gloomy prisons in which the seven remaining years of his life were to be spent. From the beginning of 1593 to the beginning of 1599 Bruno was kept in suspense from day to day, not knowing when sentence was to be delivered. It is difficult at first sight to account for a delay so unnecessary, and which must have added so greatly to his punishment, but probably indecision on the part of the Pope, and not pure cruelty, lay at the root of it. It was not easy for the Inquisition to point to any particular action or written opinion that would justify it in executing Bruno. Such satires and invectives as appeared in some of his less worthy writings he was perfectly willing to recant, frankly regretting that he should have written them. All his nobler and more important works he declares, and with evident sincerity, to be free from the faintest imputation upon the Church.* But the Inquisition was probably more logical than Bruno in perceiving that, if his opinions once found acceptance, some of the most important doctrines of the Church would be in danger. Thus, the Copernican doctrine, of which he was so fervent an apostle, was certainly against the Mosaic account of creation, though, as Bruno pointed out, it was favoured by the Book of Job. Again, his doctrine of the mutability of all things, their transformation, the unity that underlies variety, the majesty and harmony of eternal law, may, as he avers, find support in the writer of Ecclesiastes, but they are certainly against miraculous interpositions and the intercessions of saints. Yet it was indirectly rather than directly that the real danger of Bruno's works lay. Explicitly and implicitly he had attacked all superstitious worship of authority. And authority was the life-blood of the Church. He was no blatant iconoclast wishing to hew down all that was sacred with time. But he lived in an age when reverence for mere authority choked all higher reverence, even that for truth itself; when it acted as a putrefying influence, contaminating innocuous things; while it rendered that which was essentially corrupt of tenfold greater corruption.

---

* An English translation is given in the recent Life of Bruno, by I. Frith, published in Trübner's *Philosophical Series*, pp. 262-265.

We who are living in an age which is reaping the fruits of Bruno's teaching can hardly realize how insidious and widespread was this worship of authority. Yet, in our opinion, Bruno's claim to be remembered by posterity lies not so much in the scientific discoveries he helped to effect, great as these were, as in his courage to proclaim them. He was one of the very few in his day to perceive that a question can only be judged on its own merits, and that it is impossible to arrive at those merits without free and untrammelled discussion. Yet it was just this freedom of discussion that the Church had always forbidden. And, though she took seven years to arrive at the decision, she was probably only showing her customary astuteness in judging that Bruno's writings, innocent as the author himself judged them to be, must prove a source of real danger to her.

At intervals during the year 1599 attempts were made by the Inquisition to induce Bruno to recant, but he answered that he had nothing more to recant, nor knew he what he should recant. On the 8th, or according to some authorities on the 9th, of February, 1600, he was conducted from his prison to the presence of his judges to hear his sentence pronounced while he was made to kneel. After being degraded as an impenitent heretic, he was sentenced to be burnt alive. He only answered, "It may be that you are more afraid to deliver this judgment than I to receive it." On the 17th of February, clad in a *san benito,* on which flames and devils were painted, he was led to the stake in the Campo dei Fiori. A crucifix was offered him; he refused to look upon it. It might be that his long imprisonment and his cruel sentence had had the effect of exciting in him an antipathy to the Catholic Church that he had not previously felt. Then the pile was set alight. It is recorded by an eye-witness that he did not utter a cry. His ashes were collected, and soon all that was mortal of Giordano Bruno was scattered to the winds.

As there has been an attempt of late to cast doubts upon the fact of Bruno's execution—an attempt not simply confined to the Catholic party, but that has even found its way into so useful a publication as the new edition of *Chambers's Encyclopædia*—we think it well to relate the various proofs there are which seem to us to make Bruno's execution as much a matter of certainty as any historical fact not within actual human memory can be. The proofs are as follows:—

1. A letter from Scioppius giving a full and detailed account of the execution of Bruno, which took place in the presence of Scioppius himself on the 17th of February, 1600. This letter, it must be admitted,

---

* That Bruno had doubts upon some of the tenets of the Church, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, seems certain. But (to use his own words) when thus expressing himself he wrote "as a philosopher, not as a theologian:" a mode of defence less alien to the conscience of that period than it would be to our own In his nobler works, however, he seldom touched upon doctrinal matters.

was not published till 1620, but still Scioppius did not die for some time after that date, and a forgerer would hardly have dared to circulate a letter written by him and bearing his name, if not genuine, during his lifetime.*

2. Mersenne, in his book called *Impiété des Deistes,* printed in 1624, speaks of Bruno as "un athée brûlé en Italie."

3. Wacher, the Imperial ambassador at Rome 1600, mentioned the fact of Bruno's death to Kepler. (See Correspondence of Kepler and Brengger, first printed in 1858.)

4. The *Avvisi di Roma,* contained in the manuscripts of the Vatican (a sort of newspaper of those days), of the 19th of February 1600, records Bruno's execution as having taken place on the previous Thursday, the 17th.

5. The *Archives of San Giovanni Decollato,* containing a notice of the execution in all its details. The day of the week is said to be Thursday, the year 1600; but the day of the month is erroneously stated to be the 16th instead of the 17th, as it should be.

THE PASTORAL LETTER OF THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP.

From *The Freeman's Journal.*

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, BALTIMORE,
September 7, 1889.

To the Clergy, Secular and Regular, of the Archdiocese of Baltimore:

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN: It is inherent in the nature of men of principle to fly to the rescue of those who are unjustly assailed. Our feelings, on such an occasion, are a mixture of sympathy with the victim, and of indignation at the aggressor. Such sympathy and such wrath are a measure of the nobility of one's nature. Our arms instinctively go forth toward the blow, or if too late, our voices rise in loud protest.

And such a mingled feeling of righteous wrath and deep sympathy has of late been bred in every Catholic, as it should in every Christian heart, when the news came to us that upon a public square, in the city of Rome, upon the solemn Feast of Pentecost, impious men dared to unveil the statue of an apostate monk to the admiration and veneration of the thousands then and there assembled. Dragging the memory of a wild theorizer, a shameless writer, and denier of the divinity of Christ from the obscurity of a grave that had for three centuries closed upon its disgrace, these men, backed by mere brute force, have set upon a pedestal in the Holy City the statue of the infamous Bruno.

Such a proceeding is a palpable and flagrant outrage, not alone upon the Catholic, but upon the whole Christian world. It is a long-pondered, deliberately planned and well-aimed blow at all that is sound and wholesome in religion and morals. Its animus is clear from the selection of time and place, and the unchristian and defiant language employed in the unveiling of a statue of a man whose whole life breathed cowardice, pride and defiance of lawfully constituted authority. Upon the commemoration of that first great event, when the Holy Spirit of God descended into the hearts and intellects of men, these miscreants, in their blasphemous arrogance, have repudiated all dependence upon any higher power, vainly attempting to deify human reason. They have contemptuously cast off the sweet yoke of Christ. In their frantic efforts after miscalled freedom they have spurned the truth which alone could make them free.

Theirs is not the action of decent, honorable but misguided men, calmly, and with due regard to the feelings of others, promulgating a new belief, or introducing a new cult. Their attempt, as has been observed, is not so much to honor Bruno, their newly discovered martyr, as to insult and vilify the Vicar of Jesus Christ and his devoted children throughout Christendom. Indeed, their aim is higher still; they defy and insult not alone His Vicar, but Our Divine Lord Himself. From every land they have chosen as the committee to further the movement the champions of atheism, the would-be destroyers of the very foundations of Christianity. The orator of the occasion openly declared that the event of that day dealt a blow at the spiritual sovereignty of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Such a demonstration was appropriately closed by the enacting of an infamous play, written by the new saint of the worship of free thought.

It is proper, dearly beloved brethren, that the Christian world, and especially this portion, where the term "religious freedom" is understood, in a sober, Christian sense, should brand with their indignant scorn action such as this. We are not, thanks be to God, yet ready for processions in which the red and the black flags of revolutionists and anarchists are defiantly flaunted.

Furthermore, as devoted and faithful

---

* In the October number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, 1885, Mr. R. C. Christie has stated at length the numerous proofs there are in support of the genuineness of this letter.

children, we owe to our Holy Father, an emphatic and unmistakable expression of deep sympathy with him in the indignities put upon him. Above all, the plain duty of expiation rests upon us, when from a city illuminated by the teachings of the Apostles, sanctified by the spotless lives and heroic deeds of virgins and confessors, reddened by the blood of countless martyrs, there now go up blasphemies against the Most High God.

You will, therefore, at all the Masses, until further notice, recite the collect *Pro Quacunque Necessitate,* and, beginning with Monday, September 16th next, inclusively, you will conduct in your respective parishes a solemn Triduum of Expiation, with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament after Mass, the *O Salutaris* being immediately followed by the "Litany of the Saints."

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore.
P. J. DONAHUE, Chancellor.

ROMANISM AND SECULARISM.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

IT is pitiable to be obliged to recognize the evil alliance which has existed between the Romanists and the secularists in the matter of the public schools. These two deadly enemies have played, and are still playing, into each other's hands in a way which will produce results that one of the parties assuredly does not contemplate. It has ever been the misfortune of Rome, with all her faculty of organization and government, that she is prone to sacrifice the interests of the future for the sake of temporary success. If she had chosen at the time of the Reformation to put herself at the head of the movement for the advancement of learning, she might have controlled its direction, and a moderately reformed Church might have retained the spiritual command of the Christian world. To have taken that course, however, would have implied concessions mortifying to the vanity of popes and cardinals, and a haughty "we cannot" became the abdication of pontifical power in the Gothic nations of Europe. Another misfortune of Rome is her willingness to make alliances with any power or any party which for the moment serves her turn. When she has used the tool of the moment, she assumes that she will have the power to throw it away; and many a time has she found that the poor tool of a moment has become an enemy to reckon with.

In this country, if the Church of Rome had been really sagacious, and had really believed that she is to be the Church of this continent, she would never have waged war on the public schools. She would assuredly not have faulted them for teaching a modicum of Christianity. She would have praised and supported them, and would have made herself the special champion of their religious character. By so doing, she would have made sure that in those schools nothing would be taught to which she could object, and when she gained sufficient power, she might have hoped to secure still larger influence in controlling the religious teaching of the schools. At last, if her adherents should become a majority of the people, as the logical consequence of the principles she had professed and the conduct she had pursued, she would have obtained entire control of the school system.

To have taken this sagacious course would have required a temporary self-restraint of which Rome is very rarely capable. For the moment she would have had to submit; and to Rome, even for a moment, submission is intolerable. When she cannot rule, she prefers to ruin; and in working the ruin of that which she cannot rule, she delights to use her bitterest enemies as the agents of her will. In her warfare on the public schools her chief ally has been the so-called secularists, whose dream is to banish God, not only from the schools, but from the thoughts of men. The secularists in this matter were wiser than their Romish allies. They readily took up the Romish cry that the reading of the Bible in the public schools was a violation of the rights of conscience, but they very soon went on to insist that any religious teaching, or observance in schools maintained by the State is a wrong *per se,* since the State represents only secular interests, and has no mandate from the people to teach any religion.

Then Rome began loudly to cry that the public schools are godless schools, and that Christians may not lawfully send their children to godless schools. Roman Catholic Christians must therefore have their own schools, utterly apart from the control of the State.

So, then, the result is that the public school system has come to be conducted according to secularist principles. It has become, or certainly, at least, it is rapidly becoming, the acknowledged principle of public school education that it shall be exclusively secular.

Thus, Rome has raised up an enemy against herself, and has entrenched him in an impregnable position; and now she comes demanding that the State, which may not allow religion to be taught in her own schools, shall pay Roman Catholic priests, monks and nuns to teach religion in theirs! Does Rome expect her demand to be conceded? Undoubtedly; and in a few places she is right in that expectation. But not in many, nor for long. The American people, trained in the doctrine of the secularists, will not fail to apply that doctrine consistently; and every case in which it is violated in favor of Rome will only the more surely arouse the temper of the people against the power which seeks to overthrow American principles. In other words, whereas it was in the power of Rome to become the champion, and in many ways ultimately the mistress of public education, she has deliberately handed public education over to secularism, and entrenched the bitterest enemy of all religion in the very heart of the nation. When the time of reckoning comes—and it will come—Rome will yet feel the effects of her prodigious folly.

DR. SHEDD ON REVISION.

BY HENRY DAY.

From *The Evangelist*, New York.

IN an article published in the *Evangelist* September 5th, Dr. Shedd has advocated the non-revision of the Confession of Faith. When such a theologian and dialectician has spoken, it would appear as if further discussion were vain. But we are impressed with the fact that Dr. Shedd looks at the question at issue from one standpoint, and many of us from quite another. He speaks from the professor's chair the views of the astute logician; the master of dogmatic theology, to whose mind the difficulties of our creed are familiar, as one who has for years taught, explained, and defended the doctrines of the Confession, and who is more or less committed to them. There is another large class in our Church not so cultured and not so committed, who take the language of the Confession in its plain and ordinary sense, and who cannot with the same facility reason away the apparent difficulties which meet them in the Confession. I think this latter class are not convinced by the arguments of Dr. Shedd.

My observation of this discussion goes to show that it has developed two general classes: one against revision, embracing many learned professors, who have devoted their lives to teaching, explaining, and defending the Confession in its totality, and who naturally adhere to it, and embracing also others who are averse to change from natural temperament, and who cling with a kind of blind reverence to these true, honored symbols of a Church of no mean historic fame. The other class embraces those who come more in contact with the members of the Church and the needs of the world; and the great body of laymen, who take common-sense and practical views of the questions at issue. These two classes are the Conservatives and the Liberals, who have appeared in all ages on every great question affecting the progress of man in politics, religion, and all social questions. The arguments of the Conservatives are: the Confession is a monument of piety and wisdom, venerable for its historic associations. The Church has prospered under it. It is broad and liberal, and affords great liberty of interpretation. It is dangerous to begin amendment, for you cannot see the end; or to make explanations, for they must be explained, and will introduce new difficulties. "Let us work on the same old bases, in the same straight lines, and let well enough alone. All Presbyterians are Calvinists, or ought to be, and the Confession is Calvinism at high-water mark." These are the arguments of our Conservative friends for non-revision. But they do not satisfy the Liberals. In their view they do not reach the real issue. The issue in their minds is this—viz., the Confession of Faith in some of its statements is *wrong*. There is *error* in it, and this error is *vital*, that there are statements in regard to important doctrines which are not "expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence deduced therefrom" (chap. 1, sec. 6). By far the most important of these alleged errors is contained in chap. 3, sections 2, 3, 4, and 7. The essence of the objection, is that the language of these sections gives a false view of the character of God; that the ordinary meaning of the language, taken by itself and in its mildest sense, represents Him a cold, isolated, indifferent Sovereign, and in a very common and probable meaning, as a malevolent tyrant devoid of mercy, justice, and love, dooming millions of souls by the sweep of His awful decrees, before their existence and without reference to their sin, to everlasting death. They believe this view of the character of God is logically carried through the Confession, and leads to other doctrines therein stated, which are equally repulsive to Christian impulse. It admits the possible damnation of infants. It states directly the universal condemnation of all souls to whom God has not revealed Christ, however much they are striving and feeling after God, and ordering their lives according to the best light God has given them (chap. 10, sec. 4), and denies the efficacy of the blood of Christ to save them. This latter class regard these as great and vital errors, or at least doctrines not proven; that they entirely change the character of our religion from that which appears on every page of the New Testament. They do not believe them; they repel them as a libel on the God we love, and on the administration of His government over His creatures. The advocates of revision say these errors do exist, and that they are vital, and if so, they ought to be eliminated from the Confession, and that there is no room for argument about the expediency of revision in such a case. Vital error should have no place in a religious creed. The adherents of non-revision are bound to address themselves first to this point, namely, to prove from the Bible, or by necessary deduction therefrom, that there is no error in the Confession in the parts above stated. The laymen particularly wish to see these points fairly discussed, and Bible truths applied to them.

We think the burden of proof is fairly upon those who oppose revision to show affirmatively that these doctrines are fairly deduced from Scripture. The Confession implies as much (chap. 1, sec. 6). If such is the real issue—the truth or error of the Confession on the points above named—it will be seen that the arguments of our Conservative friends which I have repeated above, do not reach the real issue. They do not prove that the Confession is without error.

Let us bring Dr. Shedd's arguments to bear on this main issue of no error in the Confession. All his arguments are that it is *inexpedient* to revise, which implies that there is no substantial error, which is the question at issue.

1. Because existing forms have well met the needs of the Church. If we admit this, does it prove that the Confession is without error? It may have done all this, and we claim it has done it in *spite* of errors. God overrules errors in Church and State, so that good may come out of evil. The Constitution of the United States did a mighty work even while the taint of slavery was upon it. What engrossed the theological mind in 1647, and met the needs of the Church, does not satisfy the demands of the Church in 1889. In 1553 Calvin condemned Servetus to the stake, and the gentle Melanchthon approved the sentence; and this intolerance prevailed more or less among reformed Christians for a whole century after. This does not prove it to be right.

2. Dr. Shedd says revision is inexpedient because the reunion of the two divisions of the Church was founded on the Confession as it stands. Suppose it was, does this show that there was no error in the Confession before the division in 1837, and since the reunion in 1869? It does not reach the real issue. We assert the fact to be that the errors have existed during all this period, but the time had not arrived in the providence of God, or in the mind of the Church, to assert the errors and take a stand against them. Under this second head, Dr. Shedd would have us believe that the Confession brought the divided Church together. This cannot be so. The Confession of the Church before division in 1837, during the division till 1869, for both churches, and after reunion, was the same. As the Confession did not cause division, it did not cause reunion. Neither party changed its relation to the Confession by reunion. The most that can be said on this point, is that the Confession being the same in both Churches, it did not stand in the way of reunion, as different creeds would have done. The cause of reunion was the blessed influence of Christian love, and the desire for Christian union.

3. Dr. Shedd says "Revision will introduce new difficulties; explanations will need to be explained." Again this does not meet the issue. It does not show that the alleged errors in the Confession do not exist. It rather *assumes* that errors do not exist, but that truths are so blindly stated as to require explanation. Dr. Shedd asserts that the Presbyterian Board has issued a large and valuable library of books, expounding and explaining the Confession. It seems proper to say that a Church having nearly a million of communicants of as intelligent people as exist on the earth, but embracing all classes and conditions of men, should have a creed which they are expected to understand and to teach to their children; so clearly stated and so much in consonance with the spirit and general trend of Bible truth, that no labored treatises would be required to understand it, or to commend it to the consciences of Christian people. Dr. Shedd has brought forward for illustration the doctrine of the decrees of God, to show how explanations will need to be explained. In elaborating this illustration, the learned professor has

gone to the very heart of the difficulty of those who demand revision. His argument here is that there is no error in the Confession in regard to God's decrees. Here the issue is squarely met. If we understand him, he believes that by the decree of God for the manifestation of His own glory (and for no other reason, and without any reference to their sin), some men and angels are foreordained to everlasting death, and that these angels and men thus foreordained, were particularly and unchangeably designed to everlasting death (not punishment). That the reason for this *foreordination* (Dr. Shedd calls it *non-election*), is "sovereign, secret, and unconditional."

If I understand the logic, it is that God as a Sovereign in past eternity, as His choice and for His glory, and therefore for His pleasure, without any reference to the conduct of His creatures, by an affirmative act of His will divided all men into these two classes; and that He would have made the same decree, if it were possible that He could not have foreseen what should come to pass in the future (chap. 3, sec. 2).

If this be the doctrine of our Confession, I feel bound to say I do not believe it, but abhor it. It justifies the language of a director in Princeton Theological Seminary, who said to me "Every time I read the chapter on the decrees, it makes me shudder." According to this doctrine, if God's decrees to everlasting death were unconditioned and without reference to sin, but for His own glory, then if man had not fallen, still the non-elect would have existed, and would have gone to their final doom of everlasting death, and that without sin.

It seems to me that the sections 2, 3, 4, and 7 of chapter 3 of the Confession lead to this enormity and absurdity. Dr. Shedd has squarely met the issue here, and we are glad the discussion has opened here on its merits. We hope some of our theologians skilled in dogmatics will follow up this discussion till the whole Church shall awake, read, think, and decide for themselves. We have only given the opinions of a layman, formed by taking the plain language of the Confession and comparing the same with the whole drift of the New Testament on the boundless love of God and the fulness of His grace in Christ.

We think the whole atmosphere pervading the Confession in regard to the character of God is chilling and repulsive; while that of the New Testament is full of genial warmth, tenderness, and love. Our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount thrice calls God "*your Heavenly Father.*" The Confession not once calls Him *our Father*. The Apostle John twice in one chapter sums up His character in that one sentence—God is Love. The Confession, one of whose objects is to teach us what to believe concerning God, sums up His character as a Sovereign ruling the universe for His pleasure only. The Westminster divines seemed to delight in condemning souls to eternal death. I mean that where there seemed any doubt about the divine clemency in salvation, they always gave the doubt against the creature. They went on the theory that all were lost unless they could prove affirmatively from Scripture, their salvation. We think the creed should have been constructed on the theory that the horrors of eternal death should be affirmed of none except those of whom it is clearly affirmed in the teachings of Christ and His Apostles. The former theory seems to limit the Atonement of Christ; the latter to allow full scope for the efficacy of His blood to save to the uttermost.

Dr. Shedd's fifth point is that revision is inexpedient because it *may* abridge the liberty of interpretation. We may say with equal reason, it *may* not. If there is error in the Confession, we had better make the attempt to eliminate it. This will not abridge any liberty we now have, to believe all that is true. As an illustration, Dr. Shedd brings forward that other doctrine of the Confession, of non-elect infants, and he admits that now there is *liberty* under the Confession to believe in the damnation of infants, although he does not so believe. Here again the real question at issue is brought up. Dr. Shedd approves of this liberty to so believe, or to believe the contrary. The advocates for revision take the ground that all infants are saved, and that none should believe the contrary. This question ought to be settled by affirmative declarations of Scripture, or necessary deductions therefrom. Every Christian instinct dictates that the silence of Scripture on this subject should be interpreted in favor of infants. On the contrary, the Confession takes the silence of Scripture against the infants, and leaves some of them to the doom of death eternal. This liberty under the Confession to believe in the damnation of infants, we trust the great body of the Church will declare an error. The truth is. there are some essential and vital doctrines in which there should be no liberty. Our creed should not allow any liberty of interpretation in regard to the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, or His atonement for sin; and we should be glad to see the day when the Presbyterian Church will so alter its creed as not to allow a belief in the condemnation of any infants.

Dr. Shedd's sixth argument is that Revision is inexpedient, because the Confession as it now reads is a sufficiently broad and liberal creed for any Calvinist who professes a precise form of doctrine. Here again, we say, the question is not, Are we Calvinists? but, Is there error in the Confession? The argument is, because we are Calvinists we should not seek Revision. I am obliged to confess that I cannot clearly define what modern Calvinism is. I have not subscribed to Augustinianism or Calvinism, except what is found in the Confession. I find a constitutional provision in our Form of Government for changing our creed, which implies that the founders of the Church looked forward to the necessity of a change, and provided for it. I find that the creed has been already changed frequently, and one half of the work of the Westminster divines, viz., their Form of Government and Directory for Worship, has been discarded by our Church. How can it then be reasonably argued that further change of the Confession is inexpedient, and that we should "let the creed stand exactly as it was drawn up by the sixty-nine commissioners in five weekly sessions for nearly nine years."

Dr. Shedd in his seventh point states that Revision is inexpedient, because the Westminster Standards already make full provision for those exceptional cases on account of which Revision is claimed by its advocates to be needed. It is here assumed that Revision is demanded only to meet a few exceptional cases.

We answer, Revision is not mainly demanded for exceptional cases, but because of alleged grave and vital errors in the Confession, which should be removed. And in order to show that Revision is not expedient, it should be shown that these errors do not exist. After a full discussion of that question, and a declaration of the majority of the Church that there are no serious errors in the creed, then it will be proper to say to these exceptional cases who do not so think, that they are welcome to remain in our Church under protest. But do our Standards even now provide for these exceptional cases? It does receive to membership individuals who cannot adopt the Standards, but it will not receive that large class of young men desiring to enter the ministry, and many worthy men who are needed in the eldership, who cannot "cordially receive and adopt the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures."

Dr. Shedd calls the exceptional cases "babes in Christ," and asks "Why the whole Presbyterian Church should reverse its entire creed so as to make it fit these exceptional cases?" and "Why should the mountain go to Mahomet?" The answer to these questions, so sharply put, is this: We are trying to find out, by asking for Revision, which class is the mountain, and which is Mahomet.

If the advocates for Revision prevail, then Dr. Shedd will have to fall in with the followers of Mahomet, and come to the mountain. As we have the constitutional right to modify our creed, the advocates for Revision are hoping, by a fair trial, to show that they are not the exceptional class, the babes in Christ, who remain in the Church by sufferance. They believe the general sentiment of our Church and of all Presbyterian Churches in the world is moving in the direction of a revision of the Westminster Standards; that this movement is under the guidance of the Spirit of God, who has promised to guide His people into all truth; and that He has taught them much in the last two hundred and fifty years, which in every other respect have been the most eventful in the world's history for eighteen hundred years.

They cannot adopt the pessimistic view that the Church of this age cannot trust itself to discuss, modify, or adapt its creed to the wants of the present time, but must rely on the Westminster divines living two hundred and fifty years ago to think for them. As the Westminster divines improved on their predecessors, so they believe the broader culture, the wider experience of this age, can improve on the work of those truly great, but not inspired men.

It is to be hoped that our clergy, who, I believe, by their culture, piety, and experience have better qualifications to formulate a creed for the Church than any such class in any age have had, will discuss these great questions boldly and calmly on their merits, and that they will, in the words of James S. Candlish, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the College of the Free Church of Scotland, Glasgow, "set forth a statement of the vital truths of Christianity in a form suited and intelligible to the mind of the present age, as the Westminster Confession in many of its parts has ceased to be" (*Independent,* September 15th, 1889); and also it is greatly to be desired that our lay members, especially the elders, will carefully examine the Confession of Faith, and study its proof texts, and compare the doctrines, particularly of chaps. 3 and 10, with their Bibles, and think and reason on these great questions in such manner that they can intelligently vote upon them in Presbytery.

THE HOWLING DERVISHES.

BY REV. JOHN P. PETERS, PH.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL.

From *The Standard of the Cross and The Church.*

EVERY ONE has heard of the Howling Dervishes, and knows something about their religious services or performances. They are one of the regular sights of Constantinople. Their most important *tekkieh*, or cloister, is on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, at Scutari. Here they hold a service every Thursday afternoon at the hour of afternoon prayer, and here I visted them for the second time, two days since, under the guidance of the Rev. H. O. Dwight, well known to all who are interested in Christian missions in Turkey. To any thoughtful man such an exhibition cannot be a mere amusement; it is a study in religion, and as such full of lessons and warnings.

When we arrived the dervishes were seated on their sheepskins at the lower end of the railed inclosure, which occupies the larger part of the room, reciting their common prayers, a chapter of the Koran, the praises of Mohammed, of their founder (Rufa'ee, died 1182), and of former saints of the order. The old sheikh squatted alone at the other end of the room, facing them, with his back toward a small niche in the southwestern wall, which indicates the direction of Mecca. In and about this niche hung various weapons, axes, swords and knives, relics of deceased members, and formerly used for purposes of religious self-torture. Not very many years since the dervishes of this *tekke* were wont to burn themselves with hot irons, and cut and gash themselves with sharp weapons, as part of their religious ceremonial. Lane, in his "Modern Egyptians," tells of seeing dervishes of this order take into their mouths live coals, fan them there into a glow by their breath, roll them about with their tongues, and finally chew them up and swallow them while still at a red heat. A friend from the interior told me last year of a dervish who thrust a knife into himself in his presence. But such jugglery and self-torture in connection with their religious rites is now prohibited, at Constantinople at least, and the weapons on the wall are merely relics of the past.

A number of framed texts were also hung about the room, mainly passages from the Mohammedan scriptures. To one side of the niche was a conspicuous tapestry banner with the name of "Ali" worked upon it double. It will be remembered that "Ali" and his sons, Hasan and Husein, are especially venerated by the heretical Shiite moslems of Persia and Irak, so that among them "Ali," the prophet's nephew and son-in-law, has practically taken precedence of the prophet himself. Persian Mohammedanism, while much more fanatical than the Islam of the orthodox Sunnite or Turkish type, has nevertheless a more mystical, less literal character, and exhibits in connection with this a tendency to pantheism. The same is true in a less degree of many of the more than thirty different orders of dervishes, and among others of the Rufa'ee, or Howling Dervishes, and consequently they also pay a special reverence to "Ali." The latter was the founder of one of the two congregations from which all the dervish orders are said to be descended, and, although the few utterances of his which have been preserved are of a decidedly practical and commonplace character, he has come to be regarded as the founder and patron of mystical and allegorical, as over against literal and legal Mohammedanism. The degree of sympathy with the Persian heresy, or heretical doctrines, varies in different orders. The Bektash dervishes, who have a *tekkieh* close to Robert College, at Rumeli Hissar, even go so far as to hold a memorial service for Hasan and Husein, the murdered sons of "Ali," akin to the Persian passion play, commemorative of their death. In general, as might be expected, the dervishes are not looked upon with favor by the authorized religious leaders and teachers, although some of the latter are members of dervish orders. To a certain extent the relations and functions of the two are the same as those of the priests and prophets in the pre-exilic Jewish Church. Like the old prophets, moreover, the dervishes enjoy a very high reputation among the people at large.

The object of the dervish is to attain to a mystical, spiritual communion with God, an end which he often seeks by grossly mechanical and physical means. His watchwords are obedience and love. As a part of the discipline necessary to the development of the higher life, he practices asceticism and even bodily torture. But in many important particulars his asceticism is different from the monasticism of Buddhism, Rome and Russia. Celibacy is not necessary, indeed all the sheikhs or abbots of whom I know are married, and in many orders the post of sheikh is hereditary. So also the other members of the order do not necessarily dwell together in the cloister, nor wear a distinctive dress; they are not obliged to forsake the ordinary avocations of life, and their connection with the order may be severed at will. As to their private life, one hears the same charges which were made so frequently against the monks of the middle ages, but it is especially the wandering beggar dervishes against whom these charges are made.

But to return to the service of the Howling Dervishes. After the initial prayers were completed, two of the more experienced brethren were selected by the sheikh as the ministers or servants of the occasion, and invested with black stoles in token thereof. A number of dervishes then stood up in line, the old sheikh took his place at one end, one singer, who was joined later by three or four more, squatted on a sheepskin in front of them, and the dancing and howling began. The songs sung were love songs, mystically interpreted of the love of the soul to God, exactly as the synagogue, and following it, part at least of the Christian Church, interpreted Solomon's Song (for which interpretation compare the headings of the chapters in our authorized version with the text of the poem itself). Similarly a mystic use is made of drinking songs, and intoxication is allegorically interpreted of spiritual ecstasy. The dervish idea is the idea of love of God, which is viewed in a one-sided, imperfect manner, and sought in ecstasy, rapture, passion, and abnormal excitement. As might be expected, the allegorical interpretation of love and intoxication has led in certain orders to abuses and abominations such as have stained the record of some sects of Christian mystics. So the Bektash dervishes are said to indulge in wild orgies in their *zikr*, or ritual, and especially they employ intoxicants and opium (*hasheesh*) to bring on the ecstasy. They interpret actual intoxication mystically, while the *Rufa'ee* and others merely put an allegorical interpretation upon songs about intoxication.

While these love songs were being sung the line of dervishes was grunting and snorting, for so only can these peculiar sounds be described, the Mohammedan formula, "There is no god but God," accompanying the words by a double movement of the body, a swaying forward and backward, and a limping, stamping, side movement with the feet. Their motions and their utterances kept increasing in rapidity. The ministers relieved them of their outer robes, and provided them also with linen skull-caps in place of the turban or fez. Outsiders joined the performers and danced and howled as well and as long as they could, that so they might imbibe some of the spiritual afflatus. Two negroes took their places near the center of the line, whom, from their dexterity and endurance, we judged to be regular members of the order. Little children danced and howled in the center of the room, in imitation of their elders. Now and then some of the outside performers dropped out exhausted, but more always came in to take their places, so that with the excitement the numbers increased also. The peculiar limping character of this portion of the dance, accompanying the vehement shouting of the name of God, I am inclined to compare with the dance and prayer of the priests of Baal, 1 Kings 18 : 26 (the literal rendering of the last clause of which seems to be: "And they limped at the altar which had been made").

After the dancers had become sufficiently excited, at a given signal the limping, swaying movement stopped, and all began to bob very violently up and down without quite lifting their bare feet from the floor, flinging their heads wildly from side to side, often with hideous contortions of countenance and ecstatic grimaces. At the same time they uttered what seemed to be inarticulate sounds. This was ecstasy. The singers in front chanted even more wildly; a blind beggar who was bobbing up and down on the right of the line, shouted: "The gates of heaven," "Put love in him," "Do it with love," and other similar alleluias and fervid ejaculations; and the believers were greatly edified, but the unbelieving said that they were mad. In justice to the dervishes, by the way, I ought to add that they tried hard to suppress the alleluia beggar, and at length succeeded, reminding me ludicrously of a scene in New Haven when I saw Mr. Moody suppress a Methodist brother who persisted in interrupting his exhortation by encouraging ejaculations and glad alleluias.

But the alleluia beggar was not the only reminder of strange phenomena, some of them emphatically irrational, magical, or even heathen, which present themselves from time to time among so-called Christians. Almost the same form of excitation to religious ecstasy by means of violent physical exercise occurs among the colored people of our own country. I have in mind at this moment a certain chapel in New Haven, Baptist, I think, where the worshippers used to take hold of the back of the seats in front of them and spring up and down, shouting religious catchwords the while, until they would fall back in a state of ecstatic exhaustion. At the same time others would march through the aisles, stamping, clapping their hands, singing hymns and uttering wild cries. How much choice is there between this and the service of the Howling Dervishes?

Again, the ecstatic state and the unintelligible cries reminded me, on the one hand, of some camp-meeting scenes which I have both seen and heard of, and on the other hand, as I have already hinted, of the "tongues" disturbance in the Corinthian Church, discussed and condemned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 12 : 14. There is here, too, the same magical power attributed to the mere utterance of religious formulæ and Divine names, frequently in an utterly inarticulate manner, which one sees in certain penitential and devotional uses of the Roman Catholics, and even sometimes in the rendering of services in our own churches. The dervishes regarded the repetition of their creed and of the names and attributes of God as sanctifying the place and company, on the same theory on which among us mumbled and unintelligible prayers and holy verses are supposed to do the same thing. There is magic in them.

But the most interesting and instructive part of the service was still before us. The old sheikh now took his seat at the founder's place in front of the niche, and the healing of the sick began. First some clothing and a bottle of water for a sick person were brought to him, into which, after a brief prayer, he breathed, his breath being sanctified by the frequent repetition of the name of God. Then were brought a number of sick people who were made to lie down, a few at a time, on their faces on the wooden floor, and he walked slowly backward and forward upon their bodies. Some of them were old and feeble, and some small children, but I could not see that any suffered the least pain from the operation. Indeed the children of the neighborhood regard it as great fun, and are always on hand to be walked over as many times as the ministers will permit it. Occasionally the sheikh sought to effect a cure by merely breathing upon the patient, and not a few were passed along the line of dervishes, still grunting and bobbing up and down, to be breathed upon by all. Indeed, mere presence in that atmosphere, saturated, so to speak, with the name of God, was supposed to be a tonic, physical as well as religious. It was an unusually successful and enthusiastic meeting, and a correspondingly large number of patients, some of them persons of position, presented themselves to be cured. Some of these cases were pathetic, inasmuch as the patients were evidently grasping at this as a drowning man grasps at a straw, as a last desperate, almost hopeless chance.

It is hardly necessary to call attention to the instructive similarity of the doctrine and practice of the Howling Dervishes to the miracles of Lourdes and Knock, or to the faith and mind cures of our own benighted land. There is also precisely the same testimony to be had regarding the efficacy of this spiritual treatment of bodily ailments which can be obtained in connection with any of our own faith cures, and no sober-minded person will deny, I presume, that in certain cases both faith doctors and Howling Dervishes may and do effect cures. I suppose, however, that the particular treatment adopted by the Howling Dervishes is better adapted to the needs of the Mussulman population of Constantinople than that of our own faith doctors would be, and *vice versa.*

CONSTANTINOPLE, August 24th, 1889.

THE FAILURE.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

AGAIN let us be brave enough to face the fact that the Church in the United States has no hold, and is gaining none, on the city populations. "Summer congregations" tell the whole story, and tell it plainly. In the summer months, churches entirely closed, or opened to congregations of fifty or a hundred, where there is room for many hundreds, prove that they are used by the few who "go out of town in summer," not by the *people* who enjoy no such advantage. Go to "the residence district" of any large city and thence to the poorer districts, and compare the noble church buildings of the former with the absolute destitution of churches in the other, and the constituency of the churches appears in another way.

For some cause our so-called parochial system, which is really a congregational system, does not reach the masses of the people. That is the deplorable fact; and it behooves the Church to meet the duty it implies. If the parochial system cannot reach the masses, it is the part and duty of the Church to discover and provide something else that will; and who is to discover it, if not the great council which has made itself the board of missions of the whole Church? Would it not be better to devote a few hours or days to the retrieval of the Church's most lamentable failure in this country than to put together the most classical collection of hymns that was ever prepared for the delectation of fastidious worshippers?

In view of all these facts we again urge and beseech those whose high office and privilege it is to participate in the responsibilities of the General Convention not to let matters of mint, anise and cummin exclude the weighter matter of consulting for the spread of the Gospel, but to make this in spirit and in truth a Missionary Convention. "The field is the world." We trust that no part of that field may be neglected; that the foreign work may be thought of in all its parts; that what have too exclusively been called "domestic missions" may all have their accustomed care; that the missionary fields which exist in every diocese may be recognized as domestic missions which as closely concern the whole Church as any other missions; that the vast problem of work among the colored people may at last have the generous treatment it has never yet had; and, whatever else is forgotten or neglected, that the work of the Church in cities, which ought to be her greatest glory, but which now stands as her most lamentable failure, may be bravely and resolutely taken up.

FATHER HYACINTHE.

WHY HIS WORK HAS PROVED A FAILURE.

BY REV. A. DECOPPET.

From *The New York Observer.*

TWENTY years have elapsed since Father Hyacinthe, of the Order of Dominicans, raised his voice in eloquent and indignant appeal against the despotism of the Roman Catholic Church, of which until then he had been a staunch and worthy follower. Everybody will remember how readily that noble protest found an echo in the heart of the entire Christian world; what expectations it awakened in the breasts of all those whose abiding faith is the advancement of God's reign on earth; and with what tokens of deep sympathy Protestants of all denominations heralded the Reform which this illustrious friar strove to work out by openly withdrawing from his order and his Church.

How stands this Reform at the present hour in France? Has Father Hyacinthe met the expectations of the Christian world? Has he realized the bright hopes that he then held forth? To put these questions is as good as answering them. Father Hyacinthe's venture has not succeeded; it has merely led to the establishment of a puny Church, without a future before it, and the very existence of which is precarious. Now when, at the end of twenty years, a reform of that kind has not obtained a larger number of followers, or signalized itself by greater conquests, one may fairly look upon the enterprise as a failure. Let any one go to the chapel in the Rue d'Assas where Father Hyacinthe occasionally preaches; he will return with the painful impression that the work of the eloquent divine, far from being in progress, is declining every day. The movement of sympathy that welcomed his advent has abated; even curiosity, which in the first instance brought a goodly number of listeners to hear his eloquent voice, now that it is satisfied, no longer exists. A large proportion of the congregation is made up of foreigners on their way through Paris, who are unwilling to leave the capital without seeing and hearing a man who is one of the celebrities of the day. Without claiming to be a prophet, I think one may safely predict that the new Gallican Church will not survive its founder.

What, then, can be the cause of this afflicting failure? From a human standpoint, Father Hyacinthe had everything on his side to insure success. In the first place, remember how favorable were the times when he commenced his work. The new dogma of the Immaculate Conception had been propounded in 1854, and the famous Syllabus in 1864. Those acts inaugurated a form of Catholicism which, being intemperate and retrograde, was utterly irreconcilable with the march of modern thought and the requirements of modern society. A general feeling of discontent prevailed. Many a soul had been deeply wounded or cast down. Even among the members of the clergy a large number lamented in silence, or had to draw deeply on their fund of attachment to the Holy Church not to protest against the spiritual despotism of the Papacy. The ground, in fact, seemed admirably prepared for a new reformation.

To all this should be further added the fact that Father Hyacinthe was already a well-known man. He had acquired a wide-spread and deserved reputation as a preacher at Notre Dame. He possessed, and still possesses, admirable talent and genuine power as an orator. His eloquence is warm, highly-colored and poetical, full of movements and images that recall the prophets of Israel.

To undeniable talents Father Hyacinthe added serious piety, an amiable character, and something gentle, affectionate, and modest which proceeded from his whole person. He was, in fact, a noble figure, for he was in every way a man, a conscience, and a character, which at any time command deference and attract sympathy.

With so many elements deserving of respect in his favor, how comes it, I ask, that the Reform set on foot by Father Hyacinthe should have miscarried? The main cause will be found in the fact that it was too exclusively ecclesiastical. The attention of the reformer was too entirely absorbed by the Church question. He constantly reverted to it in his addresses, which took the shape of lectures rather than of edifying sermons. Catholicism, Protestantism, Gallicanism—and ever so many more isms—were and still are his ever-recurring themes. Where is the true Church? was the fundamental question to which he everlastingly returned. Now, this question, however important, is not of those that quicken the hearts of the people. The people, in fact, care nothing about it. Father Hyacinthe, however, made sure that he was going to stir up the masses with his idea. This was a mistake. The masses are stirred only with what awakens conscience in its inmost depths. Had Father Hyacinthe turned to account those admirable powers of speech which are his, and preached on the loftier subjects of repentance, conversion, free salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, and kindred topics, he would have responded to that durable and deep-seated want which is to be found in every human breast, and brought about a religious revival in the midst of the French people. Hence would have sprung into life the Church he sought to found. The root idea would have given birth to the outer form. From the centre he would have reached the circumference. Instead of that, he started from the outside surface—on a question merely secondary after all—and has never been able to get to the core. People listened while he expatiated in eloquent terms on vague generalities in ism; he was admired, nay, often applauded; but, after hearing him, no one ever raised a voice to ask, "What must I do to be saved?"

The reformers of the sixteenth century acted in quite a different way. With them the Church question came up only after the question of salvation; the outer garb was subordinate to the inner life; they cast into the hearts of the people that great but now forgotten aphorism: "The just shall live by faith!" And that is how they brought the people out of darkness to the light, from death to life, and why their work endures to this day. The Church question troubled them so little, that they did not even think of quitting the Church in which they had been born. It was, in fact, their own Church that drove them out from its midst, that excommunicated them. You cannot make yourself master of a man by catching hold of him by the coat-button; you must grasp him firmly round the body. Father Hyacinthe did not know how to reach souls by enlisting their concern about the great need of salvation and life which exists, more or less consciously, at the bottom of every man's heart. This was the first reason of his failure.

The second reason is the equivocal position in which he delighted to remain by claiming on all occasions the title of Catholic, when he had severed all connection between himself and official Catholicism. In a purely logical and theological sense, he had of course a perfect right to do so. Every sincere Christian is a Catholic in the sense that he belongs to the Universal Church. But a purely logical point of view is not the one that strikes and convinces the crowd. Father Hyacinthe was no longer a Catholic in the popular, historical, and ordinary sense of the term, from the day he no longer accepted all the dogmas ordered by the indisputable and infallible authority of the Pope. If anything, he was a Protestant; he repudiated, however, with energy, that glorious name. Hence a position which was more or less false and which contributed not a little to his failure. The people like clear, plain ideas, and well-defined situations. Theological subtleties have no hold upon them. Words also have their significance. To cling to a title which, when personally used, must be twisted from its popular meaning and bolstered by a whole host of theological commentaries, is willingly to court misconception.

Again, Father Hyacinthe's attitude towards the Protestants, an attitude that finally alienated them completely from him, helped to render his efforts sterile. In the attempt at reform which he had undertaken, he failed to see that the Protestants were his natural allies, that his best interest was to spare them, or at least not to wound them ; to treat them as brothers and do all he could to bind closer together the common bond of fellowship, not seek to estrange them from him.

Instead of that, he lost no opportunity in declaring that he was none of them, nor belonged to any of their denominations : that they were as evidently beyond the pale of the true Church as the Ultramontanes. On more than one occasion he railed at them in words which stung them to the quick, as when he said that Protestantism was nothing else than Cainism, and wounded them the deeper that the Protestants from the outset had been his only friends. They had given him ample proof of this friendly spirit, upholding and encouraging him in his struggle against Rome, assisting him not only with their sympathy, but by their presence at his lectures and by their contributions. The Protestants naturally cooled in their admiration of him. Their attitude to-day is one of reserve ; they no longer throw open the doors of their temples to him as at the outset ; they invite him no longer to speak at their meetings as they formerly did ; no longer do they show the same eagerness in going to listen to his preaching.

Can anybody fairly reproach them for their coolness ? And when they accuse Father Hyacinthe of ingratitude in failing to show some of that spirit of fraternal regard to which they consider themselves entitled, who shall affirm they are entirely in the wrong ?

Abandoned in a measure by his natural allies, placed in an ambiguous and untenable position midway between Catholicism and Protestantism, while he still belongs to both —to the first by the groundwork of his dogmatics and to the second by his method ; preaching about his Church rather than about Jesus Christ, Father Hyacinthe has fairly condemned himself to impotency. His Church is without hope in the future, and may be said scarcely to have an existence in the present. It is merely the courageous protest of a Christian conscience. It cannot be looked upon as the germ of a work fruitful in revival and reform. He is not the only one to deplore this.

All true friends of the gospel regret that such rare gifts should have produced such meagre results, and that the harvesting should have accorded so ill with the joyful hopes first awakened in every Christian breast by so noble and valiant a sower.

PREACHING TO THE PHYSICAL MAN.

BY JAMES BUCKHAM.

From *Zion's Herald*, Boston.

Hugh Price Hughes, the eminent English Methodist, says, in one of his sermons : "I have no disembodied souls in my congregation." This trenchant remark was uttered by way of criticism of that sort of preaching which addresses itself solely to the spiritual man, leaving out of account the body with its peculiar needs, its appetites, its evil habits, its inherited tendencies, its faults, failings and weaknesses of every sort. The remark is full of force ; the subject is timely. Never, perhaps, was there a time when the tendency among preachers was so strong and so general as at present, to address themselves to the spiritual part of their congregations—to the hypothetic disembodied soul which Dr. Hughes speaks of.

This tendency is the product of several factors, which we must content ourselves with merely mentioning. One of them is the prevalence of a higher culture among both ministers and congregations. This seems to prompt to a more lofty range of thought and discussion than was customary a generation ago. Another factor is the growing spirituality among the young people in our churches. Still another is the popular demand for what is known as "fine" or elegant preaching. All these things are direct inducements to the pastor to select spiritual themes for his discourses. It has come to seem almost coarse or undignified for a minister to "preach down" to the carnal element in his congregation. Plain, practical talk about the human body—why, that is the province of the doctors, the modern minister seems to be saying by his silence on such topics.

And yet no fact can be more evident than that the body and soul are so knit together as to be practically one. The body is, in a sense, the glove of the soul. There is a likeness, a conformity between them which this illustration exactly expresses. When we come, in heaven, to discern with the spiritual eye alone, we shall recognize the immaterial hand from its conformity to the material glove. Christ emphasized this close and intimate connection of the body and the soul. Christianity exalts the body as no other religion does—makes it the very temple of the indwelling Divine Spirit.

To neglect, therefore, so important a component part of *man*, must be indeed a grave and serious fault on the part of the preachers. It implies a total disregard of some very vital facts. Man is a two-fold creature. He is always to be two-fold, bi-essential. The body is to rise from the grave and co-exist with the spirit. These two portions of our being are constantly acting and re-acting upon each other, in the present life. Each of them has a distinct and very strong influence upon its counterpart. The body left to itself, its carnal appetites, passions, tendencies, is forever dragging down the soul, like a leaden weight about the neck of a swimmer. The soul aspires, but it cannot raise an unwilling body. The very first requirement of the Christian life is the regeneration of the body. Unless that be born anew, no man can be redeemed.

Let the preacher ponder these facts. They are as essential to homiletics as the rocks that rib the earth. Preach to the body. Preach it down—and up. Preach purity, preach cleanliness, preach health, preach temperance. Preach muscular Christianity, preach an unreproachable manhood. Preach simplicity of life, hardihood, endurance. Preach the conservation of vital energy. Preach Biblical hygiene. The Bible abounds in texts that themselves were preached to the body. Remember that your congregations are not composed of disembodied souls. "Angels in the Catholic mythology have nothing but heads," says Balzac. Let it not be said by some carping critic that saints in the Protestant churches have nothing but souls.

And let it be remembered that in preaching to the body the minister does not neglect the spiritual welfare of his congregations. A good, forcible sermon preached to the body will glance into the soul like a refracted beam of light.

ORTHODOXY DEAD AGAIN.

From *The Examiner*, New York.

That the "orthodox" churches are no longer orthodox is a comforting delusion, believed by many because they wish it to be true. That the old faiths are obsolete or obsolescent is an assertion of which some seem never to tire. The *Boston Transcript* has lately made it with fresh emphasis. Look at the doctrine of everlasting punishment, they say; those who profess to hold this doctrine cannot really believe it. They do not preach it as they once did, and if they did preach it the pews would be emptied. By their lightness of demeanor they testify to the same state of disbelief; for, if Christians really believed that a large part of the world is going to so terrible a doom, they would be more earnest in warning men. Churches would not be closed and ministers would take no long vacations in summer, but in all seasons no effort would be spared to rescue men from their impending doom.

On the face of it, this seems a grave indictment of "orthodox" Christianity. It makes out a case sufficiently plausible to mislead one who does not look below the surface. But will the case bear examination? Take the latter objection first: the alleged inconsistency between the professed belief and the practical conduct of Christian people. Does this prove anything against the sincerity of the belief? Nothing whatever, and for this excellent reason, that such inconsistency is one of the commonest phenomena of human nature. There is not a drunkard who is not thoroughly convinced that strong drink is a curse to him, that it is dragging his body down to the grave and his soul to the pit; but he does not therefore reform. There is no man living who is not certain he must die, in a few years at most, in a few hours possibly; yet we all go on working and planning as if we had a century before us. Men do not logically deduce their conduct from their beliefs, especially when selfishness exerts a powerful influence in an opposite direction. Life is full of this inconsistency between men's actual performance and the principles by which they acknowledge that they ought to be guided.

Another consideration must not be forgotten. There is a limit to the capacity of the human mind to feel acute emotion. Neither ecstatic joys nor soul-rending sorrows can long endure; though they may not wholly pass away, their intensity gradually subsides, and ordinary feelings resume their sway. At times the Christian's soul may be full of anguish as he contemplates the condition of the world and the doom of the unsaved; but if he had the will he has not the power to maintain his emotions thus at fever heat. Nor would his spiritual life be wholesome or beneficent, if he should succeed. He would become morbid, and his zeal would defeat its own object.

There is quite as little force in the plea that the "orthodox" doctrines are not preached now as they were once. Of course they are not. But then, nothing is done as it once was. We do not think precisely as our fathers thought, and we differ still more from them in the way we express what we do think. Theological fashions change as do fashions in dress, but the changes affect only the outward garb, not the inner substance. We cast the old truths in new moulds, we clothe them with new forms of expression, we see them from a different angle of vision, but they are the same old truths, and are as firmly held as ever. We may alter the proportions, we may vary the emphasis, in conformity to present views of the teaching of the Scriptures, but we give up nothing that is contained in that revelation of God's will and purposes.

The decadence and death of orthodox Christianity have often been predicted, but it has survived all the prophets, and has never been more firmly believed in than now.

THE POPULARITY OF HERESY.

From *The Christian-Evangelist*, St. Louis, Mo.

PAUL was a heretic in the opinion of the Jews, and so were all Christians. Everything new is heresy until it gains the ascendency, and then the old becomes heretical. Heresy, like orthodoxy, is neither a fixed quantity nor a measurable quality; it means different things in different places, and every man in the world is a heretic in the estimation of somebody else. In Roman Catholic countries dissent from the Roman Catholic church is heresy—Roman Catholicism is orthodoxy; everything else is heresy and sectarianism. In England dissent from the established church is heresy, and the Roman Catholic church herself is heretical and sectarian. In Denmark and Sweden dissent from the Lutheran church is heresy, and the Roman Catholic and English churches are alike heretical. In England, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Independency have in turn been alike orthodox and heretical. In this country, where the people are happily free from the curse of an established church, heresy has a different meaning. With Roman Catholics and Episcopalians it still means dissent from the doctrines and practices of their respective churches; but its current usage in Protestant communions is very different. It is no longer dissent from a particular church that constitutes heresy, but a dissent from sects in general and in particular—at least from all or any that belong to that Mutual Admiration Society known as Evangelical, who have elected each other to special privileges, and have combined to draw a line of circumference, within which is the charmed circle of orthodoxy and salvation; without which all is given over to heresy and damnation. To make war on any or all of these sects, or on the sect principle; to deny their divine right to be what they are, or their equal claims to be "branches of the true church;" or to attempt the annihilation of their distinctions and the overthrow of their denominationalism—this is heresy. He who in the breadth of his catholicity and liberality embraces all evangelical denominations, believes in their equal claims to be churches of Christ, winks at their errors, condones their faults, and piously professes to think that one Protestant church is about as good as another, is orthodox; but he who believes only in one sect, or in none, is a heretic. This variable and somewhat uncertain meaning of the term and the fact that every man in the world is a heretic in the estimation of somebody else have rendered the term quite harmless in these our modern days. What a tremendous change has come over the world in respect to the odium of the charge of heresy! To be suspected of the slightest departure from the orthodox theology of the time, or of the least sympathy with opinions that did not bear the stamp of the popular ecclesiastical mint, was but a short time ago the most damaging crime of which a man could be accused.

Two centuries ago the charge of heresy was worse than the brand of Cain. The heretic was looked upon with unconcealed horror, and treated with less consideration than a monster of the sea or a wild beast of the forest. The basest and most degraded criminal, enveloped in dungeon horrors and awaiting the gallows or "electrocution," is treated with more humanity and kindness now than the noblest and purest man who merely differed in opinion on some trivial doctrinal question with the church magnates of his age and country, was treated in Germany, France, Switzerland, Spain, and even in England, long after the commencement of the Lutheran Reformation. To be convicted of heresy meant the confiscation of property for the benefit of the church coffers, the loss of the common rights of citizenship, the loss of reputation, and generally imprisonment, torture, and death. Bullets, racks, fagots, and thumb-screws were considered the most effective arguments wherewith to convince the heretic of his mistakes in daring to believe anything the church didn't believe. A breath of suspicion against a man's orthodoxy was a sufficient pretext on which to slit his nose, cut off his ears, tear out his tongue by the roots, burn his flesh, splinter his bones, or pillory him in a public thoroughfare till he recanted or confessed his heresy. And long after this red-handed violence and physical torture ceased to be an orthodox method of punishing heresy there was a moral persecution in the withdrawal of patronage in business, the loss of reputation, social ostracism, and the consciousness of being regarded with bitterness and horror, that made the heretic, so called, scarcely less uncomfortable than in the olden time of the inquisition and its accompanying terrors. Many in those times who felt a contempt in their hearts for the abuses and bigotries that exercised themselves in the name of religion, dared not to speak out for fear of the consequences. They knew that they would be hated, persecuted, and have their names cast out as evil. And hence, like Erasmus, the German philosopher of the Reformation, they sat on the fence, or to maintain an equilibrium of safety they spoke an equal number of words on both sides.

But how wonderfully different are things to-day! There are no disabilities for heresy in these enlightened times, either civil, social, religious, political or reputational. On the contrary, it is the quickest route to greatness. It is the short cut to renown and popularity. The modern heretic has all the glories of martyrdom without its sufferings. Modern culture is lionizing heresy, especially in religion. If a minister in these days is dull, stupid and unattractive, and cannot induce people to come and listen to his weekly installment of platitudes, let him give forth some of the "ideahs" of modern "culchah," announce himself an advanced "thinkah," give vent to a few heretical opinions which will bring him into rebellion against the constituted authorities of his church, and his reputation is made. The depleted exchequer will suddenly swell, the empty pews will fill up, the aisles and vacant seats will be called into requisition to accommodate the increasing multitudes who flock to hear the hero of heresy. If he speaks at a public meeting his rising is a signal for a perfect ovation of applause, such as only a prince or a warrior chieftain might expect. The newspapers are all in his favor; they eulogize him as a persecuted man who is fighting for liberty, and exhaust the dictionary supply of bitter expletives to characterize his opponents, who are narrow, bigoted, hypocritical, and everything bad. The best known names in the annals of current history are those who have been arraigned for heresy, such as David Swing of Chicago and Professor Robertson Smith of Scotland. It at once raises a man to national importance and gives him a national reputation.

If a man can only get up a good heresy case now-a-days his fortune is made. He need not be brilliant, or profound, or scholarly, or eloquent, or specially attractive, but only eccentric and heretical. A man now has only to declare himself an evolutionist, contradict the Mosaic account of the creation and the Fall, deny that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, affirm that the inspiration of Isaiah and Paul was the same in kind and only different in degree to that of Shakespeare and Tennyson, affirm that the incarnation and the resurrection are not historic realities, but rhetorical draperies to illustrate the idea of the indwelling of God in man, and the rising of man into a new life—let him do all these or any one of them, and men will throw their hats into the air and shout themselves hoarse in his glorification. The newspapers at any rate will espouse his cause and advertise him gratuitously all over the world. Who would not live in the nineteenth century and be a heretic?

EVERY-DAY CHURCH WORK.

From *The Golden Rule*, Boston.

We have watched with unqualified approval the growing interest in the practical phases of church work in this country. In all of our great cities there is springing up a feeling of dissatisfaction as to the results of present methods of work, and a desire to find something better. One of the signs of this new feeling is the sympathetic interest with which Christians of all denominations are watching the new church enterprises which are employing special methods in their attempts to reach the unchurched masses.

During the past five years quite a number of these enterprises have been started, as, for example, St. George's Church in New York, Bethany Church, Philadelphia, Berkeley Temple, Boston, Hope Church, Springfield, and Pilgrim Church, Worcester. No two of these churches are doing their work in the same way, but it is interesting to notice that most of them make much of the principle that the gospel is concerned with body, soul and spirit, with Sunday and all the rest of the week. There is not half the danger of secularizing the church that there is of failing to spiritualize secular things. The church of the past has stood too much isolated from the daily affairs of men. It has too often been nothing but a pulpit platform, open once or twice a Sunday for the edification of a few respectable church-goers.

With the church doors closed most of the week, and the church organization practically inoperative save as an ecclesiastical body, there is very little to attract the attention of those who are indifferent to religious matters. They see the imposing structure, and see in the newspapers the reports of the eloquent sermons which are preached there on Sunday. They know about the church quarrels and the shortcomings of the ministers, and the sum total of their impression of the word church is a fine edifice, plus a fine sermon, with, now and then, a fine scandal ; an impression due, on the one hand, to the inactivity of the friends of the church, and, on the other hand, to the activity of its critics. What possible reason can be given why a Young Men's Christian Association should keep open doors all the week, and be engaged in all kinds of secular work, in order to reach and save young men, while the church, which claims to be the body and to enshrine the beating heart of the Christ of the world, is sitting in practical idleness six days out of the seven ? It is not enough to say, by way of excuse for this idleness, that the church is working through the individual Christians out in the world. That is a sophism which has in it the ultimate extinction of the church as an organization, and is contrary to the design of its Founder. Every Christian has a twofold duty. He stands before the world as a Christian, and, at the same time, as a member of an organized institution. He is a man, but he is also a soldier. He must act in and for and with an army. His duty as a man does not nullify or supersede his duty as a soldier. His obligations as an individual Christian are not identical with his obligations as a church-member. In the latter relation he is under a corporate obligation He is bound to see that the church, as a church, makes its legitimate impression upon the world as the source and centre of all philanthropic and beneficent ministration. Otherwise, why need he belong to a church ? Why need there be any church ? The logical outcome of our present policy of relegating to individuals that " daily ministration" which was the duty of the early church as a corporate body is the final extinction of the church itself.

THE LOG-CABIN COLLEGE OF THE OLD NORTH STATE.

BY SARAH GOULD.

From *The Christian Intelligencer*, New York.

It was opened in Guilford County, North Carolina, 1765, by the Rev. Dr. David Caldwell, a Presbyterian missionary. He was a man of iron constitution, strong practical sense and striking originality. His peculiar talent—sustained by weight of character and kindness—for drawing out the best intellectual faculties, secured from his pupils lasting respect and love. Youth from all the Southern States assembled for his instruction in The Log Cabin. This was a structure two stories high, with a chimney through the centre. Fifty ministers were under his training. Many of his scholars rose to distinction as statesmen, lawyers and judges. Five were governors of different States. Theology, the classics and the sciences were all taught by himself. His mode of discipline was beyond imitation. It is said that no one was ever expelled from his school. The rod was almost unknown. For offences, his looks, with a few words, sufficed. His manner sometimes left the transgressor in doubt whether something further was not in reserve !

" His Log Cabin," writes the Rev. E. B. Currie, " served for many years as an Academy, a College and a Theological Seminary. His manner of governing the school, the family and the churches, was much the same —on the mild plan, attended with wit and humor. Few men have ever succeeded in keeping better order."

Dr. Caldwell's wife was a lady of amiability, education and superior intelligence. She was an eminent Christian, and had a powerful influence on the College. She was continually resorted to by students anxious for their soul's salvation. Many became preachers who had not thought of it before entering the College. Seven were licensed at one time. It became a by-word that " Dr. Caldwell made the scholars, but Mrs. Caldwell made the preachers." She was the daughter of the Rev. Alexander Craighead, of Mecklenburg County, and a native of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania—the same place as her husband.

" He had a large school," continues Mr. Currie, " which he generally attended five days in the week, two large churches which he catechised twice a year, four communions which lasted four days each, besides visiting the sick, preaching to vacant churches and studying."

His recreation was labor. With his own hands he ditched and irrigated his meadows, devoting an hour or two morning and evening ; and if not thus occupied, was always busy at other work. No physician lived near him ; and the settlement being new, the people were unprovided with medicines. He studied with a Philadelphia physician, who spent a year at his house, where he died. After the physician's death, Dr. Caldwell purchased his books at a low price, and became the only practitioner in a region twenty miles around.

The first minister of the Church of England had come to North Carolina in 1704. From that time till 1776 people of every religious profession were taxed for "the erection of churches, purchase of glebes, and support of church ministers." A law passed at Wilmington, N. C., January 30th, 1764, compelling all qualified persons, "under a penalty of twenty shillings," to subscribe to the following: "I will not oppose the doctrine, discipline and liturgy of the Church of England as by law established." His persistent efforts in the cause of Presbyterianism —it cannot be questioned—did much to promote religious freedom in the South.

Dr. Caldwell was born in 1765, and apprenticed to a carpenter until twenty-one years of age. After working at the trade four years more, he became anxious to preach. By teaching and studying alternately, he managed to get a college education. His own hard experience and ability in communicating, induced him to share the burdens of others; and he benefited multitudes gratuitously. His terms of tuition never exceeded ten or twelve dollars per annum.

He lived ninety-nine years, and his last days were enlivened by visits and letters from men prominent in the world—some with heads as white as his own—who gratefully acknowledged his devoted care, asserting that their highest aspirations and their success in life were owing to his teachings in the College of The Log Cabin.

THE GERMAN REFORMED AND THE CONGREGATIONALISTS.

BY REV. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston.

THE German Reformed Church grew out of the fact that the Protestant Christians of Switzerland and Germany could not accept all the teachings of either Zwingli or Luther, and preferred the type of doctrine taught by Melanchthon, and afterwards systematized by Calvin. Melanchthon was the reformer of the Palatinate, the rich and beautiful country on the upper Rhine, of which Heidelberg on the Neckar was the capital. The elector, Frederick III., surnamed the Pious, one of the seven princes who, in the name of the people, elected the emperor of Germany, was the first ruler professing the non-Lutheran form of the Protestant faith. He invited two young theologians, exiled for their faith, to chairs of theology in the Heidelberg University, and requested them to prepare a catechism and symbol of faith. The result of the labors of these young men, Ursinus and Olevianus, aged respectively twenty-six and twenty-eight, was the Heidelberg Catechism. This one symbol and standard of the German Reformed Church seems like a work of inspiration. It is the simplest, grandest, most catholic and most Scriptural of all the Reformation confessions. It deals less with logic than with experience, and is saturated, not so much with metaphysics, as with Scripture. It soon became the standard of the Reformed churches in Germany, Holland and Hungary. By voyagers, explorers, the dominie, and the schoolmaster, it was borne by the Dutch into all continents. It was the first Protestant catechism taught in America. First published in 1563, it has been translated into all the languages of Europe, and into many Asiatic and African tongues, including Hebrew and Arabic. Four English translations from the Latin were made as early as 1591, and studied in Scotland and England, as well as by the British refugees in Holland. After the Bible, The Imitation of Christ, and The Pilgrim's Progress, no other book has been so widely known and translated as the Heidelberg Catechism. Its teachings are grouped around the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the twelve articles of the Christian faith commonly called "The Apostles' Creed." While the Dutch, in the name of "scientific" theology, have added five other monuments of confessional symbolism, including the canons of the Synod of Dort (which the Pilgrims and their leader so stoutly defended), and while the British have elaborated the Westminster theology (with more proof-texts from the Old than from the New Testament), the German Reformed Christians hold to this one standard of simple, vital, experimental, catholic Christianity.

There are Reformed churches in every country in Europe, and in the European part of Asia, Africa, and Oceanica, comprising nearly forty distinct bodies, in which many languages are used, numbering, in 1885, 10,405,025 adherents, 7,031,310 communicants, 6,233 congregations, and 5,726 ministers. An expert, Rev. J. H. Dubbs, D.D., of Lancaster, Pa., considers these figures (which are exclusive of the 18,310,929 adherents and 9,364,968 communicants of Presbyterian churches) to be much below the mark. Outside of Europe, the Reformed people have been scattered by colonization, by commerce and enterprise, but only occasionally by persecution. How, then, came the Germans so early to the United States, and so numerously to Pennsylvania?

To tell the whole story would be to outline the Thirty Years' War, 1618–1648, when Germany was the battle-ground of Europe, and Protestants and Romanists fought each other, the one for freedom, the other to restore old faiths and re-rivet broken chains. When the Protestant cause seemed lost, Gustavus Adolphus appeared with his Swedes to the rescue of liberty. The treaty of Westphalia, though lauded as a supposed confirmation of German freedom of conscience, was in reality a triumph of French diplomacy, and in one sense worse than the war. It divided Germany into fractions in order that the France of Richelieu and Louis XIII. and XIV. might be supreme. It was Louis XIV. who cut from the German fatherland a slice of Alsace, secured in their villainous power the robber barons who he knew would not only prevent the unity of Germany, but grind the people, impoverished by a generation of war and the loss of industries and commerce which, during the interval, England and Holland had attracted. He it was who so favored the Jesuits that, after a few years, Romanism had been introduced into 1,922 Protestant towns and villages. This latter process is now being repeated in Canada, the French gradually ousting the English from many places. Priests and orators still cite as precedents, to fire and encourage the squatter-conquerors, the success won in Germany during the age of Louis Quatorze. On Germany's misery, France throve for another generation. In 1689, disappointed in his scheme to be elected emperor, Louis XIV. perfidiously, in time of peace, seized Alsace. Claiming also the Palatinate, he invaded it, burning towns and cities, devastating fields and vineyards, and turning the fairest part of Germany into a desert. Over one hundred thousand people, robbed, homeless, hungry and starving, wandered in field and forest, until the land stank with unburied corpses. No one can fully understand the eagerness and calm unity with which the Germans uprose in 1871 to wreak the nursed vengeance of nearly two centuries on their old oppressors, for the awful cruelties of the French invasions of 1689 and later years.

Tens of thousands of German refugees were fed and sheltered in Holland, and sent to the Dutch colonies. Others reached England, and soon began therefrom the first of the many emigrations to Pennsylvania. The war and desolation continuing, another horde of 30,000 peasants fled from home. Soon, near cities in Holland and England were encampments of "Palatines," living in the open air and in misery. Escaping massacre at the hands of British roughs and Protestant fanatics, the Roman Catholics were sent back to Germany. Other thousands were distributed in Ireland, and on English noblemen's estates to earn a livelihood. The remainder, well robbed in transit, reached the British colonies, most of which were within the limits of the present United States. Here, afflictions, compared to which those suffered by the Pilgrim fathers were mild experiences, met the refugees. In Mississippi they died of yellow-fever, and in North Carolina they were massacred by the Tuscarora Indians. In Pennsylvania alone they found peace, health, prosperity, political and religious freedom. The news of their happy condition reaching Europe attracted thousands of Swiss and Germans, some very poor, some in comfortable circumstances, but all frugal and industrious. Outflowing from "the Christian Commonwealth" of Pennsylvania, they settled also in the Mohawk Valley and other points in New York, and downward into the Shenandoah and other valleys of Virginia, and in the Carolinas. The general name given to all these people was "Palatines." Many of the battle-fields of our late Civil War were on the ground first settled by "this one race in the United States which most fully got into the soil," and have held their ancestral seats with less change of ownership than any other. In the Revolutionary War no people were more loyal to the cause of American independence. They formed one-third of the population of Pennsylvania. The German regiments usually went into battle singing hymns. Maryland also sent a German regiment, and Washington's body-guard of fifty-seven men were Germans. The European drill masters, chief of whom was Steuben (an elder in the German Reformed Church), the man for the hour at Valley Forge, and who so drilled the Continentals that they never again were worsted by equal forces, were Germans. The most stubbornly contested, and, for the numbers engaged, the bloodiest, battle of the war was fought at Oriskany, N. Y., by the Palatine Germans. The preaching and social and personal influence of the Pennsylvania Germans—led off by Washington's "baker general," Ludwick—did more to decimate by desertion, and weaken by enlightenment, the ranks of the Hessians—honest men, misguided and goaded to strange acts by British officers' lies about the Americans—than all the infantry bullets or artillery balls of militia and Continentals, or the accidents and sicknesses of war. Not a few thrifty farms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Virginia are to-day owned by the descendants of "converted" Hessians. Custer, the brilliant cavalry leader and boy-general of the late war, who "never lost a gun or a color," was the great-grandson of one of those Hessian "mercenaries" who so numerously refused to be exchanged when the war was over.

Not all the Germans who have settled Pennsylvania's lovely valleys were of the Reformed Church. There were also Quakers, Moravians, Mennonites or Tunkers, Lutherans and Schwenkfelders. Most interesting to us, as Congregationalists, are these latter, who were followers of the German nobleman, Count Schwenkfeld, one of the reformers who differed from both Luther and Calvin as to the doctrine of the Eucharist. The Schwenkfelders are Congregationalist in polity, and have sloughed off the main errors of their teacher. Besides a few congregations in Europe, they have five or six churches, with a thousand or more members, in Pennsylvania. A very handsome edition of the entire writings of Schwenkfeld is to be edited by Rev. Dr. Chester D. Hartranft, now of Hartford, himself a good, but by no means an exceptional, specimen of Pennsylvania German stock. The first ecclesiastical protest (1688) against slavery, the first book (1737) published against slavery, the first paper mill (1690), the first Bible (1743) printed, the finest and largest specimen of colonial printing and book-making, the first work (1770) on the philosophy of pedagogics, in America, came from the Pennsylvania Germans. An expert typographer has estimated that one-half of all the books printed by Franklin were for the Germans.

The first German Reformed *coetus*, or synod, which was in reality an advisory body like a Congregational conference or council, was formed in 1747 by the famous Michael Slatter; and in 1793 the Church became entirely independent of the Classis of Amsterdam. Now, out of 802 ministers and 185,000 members, 538 of the former, or 67 per cent., live in Pennsylvania or Ohio. In New Jersey there are 140 ministers, in Michigan 35, and westward 35. With 16 colleges and schools, 15 English and 6 German periodicals, and 4 orphans' homes, the Reformed Church in the United States does not lack for educational facilities. One-half of her ministers can preach in the German tongue. In the majority of the churches English is used.

Though in faith and doctrine substantially one with Congregationalists, the German Reformed Christians as a body have had little to do with New England churches, though in nearly all the large towns and the manufacturing villages individuals from the fatherland enter the Congregational churches. There is a German Reformed church in Boston, and the pastor, Rev. L. B. Schwartz, is a man of high culture. At Waldoborough, Me., from 1751 to 1851, a large colony of Lutherans and Reformers had a union church, celebrating the Lord's Supper alternately according to the two rites, until, too few in numbers to maintain organization, they entered as a body the Congregational church there. Besides the fair sprinkling of German names in our Year-Book, and the ministers crossing the bounds into the Congregational fold, there are others who, like Rev. N. H. Keyes and E. E. Higbee, New England men, have adorned Reformed pulpits. In the West, even more than in the East, there are many thousands of people born in the German Reformed Church who are one with us in faith, doctrine and polity.

HONORARY (?) DEGREES.

From *The Christian Herald*, Detroit, Mich.

If the "Correspondence University" of Chicago effects no other object, it is causing a thorough ventilation of the honorary degree question. It has proved to be a more combustible theme than we imagined a few weeks ago. On the strength of an article in a Chicago daily which appeared to give an authentic history of this "University" from its worthy beginning to its "diploma mill" conclusion, and from circulars which have been received at this and other offices, there has seemed to be no reasonable doubt that the concern was a fraud, and should be denounced as such. It has been so denounced by the religious press generally. Those who have won scholarly distinction by studious effort and received degrees from first-class institutions, upon which they in turn have reflected honor, have protested that there was no protection for a man unless he published the institution from which he received his degree. Such a suggestion is rather appalling. In a newspaper office many perplexities arise over the question of getting just the proper quantity and assortment of alphabet to trail after a man's name, and if from one to a half-dozen educational institutions, according to the number of degrees received, must be added to the tail of each human comet—we feel unequal even to the calm contemplation of the burden which would be imposed.

There is one reflection which perhaps may not have occurred to those who covet these alphabetical distinctions: the great men of the world are known by the shortest names. Even the respectful "Mr." is dropped off. With all their undoubted right to official and scholarly titles, the world talks of Bismarck and Gladstone: prefixes and suffixes are reserved for the third-rate luminaries. Tennyson's title of "Lord" is rarely used. It is as ridiculous before his resplendent genius as a tallow candle shedding its sickly ray before an electric light. The most eminent Baptist preacher is known as Spurgeon the world over. Beecher was only Beecher. Our most eminent presidents seldom received their title. The names of Washington and Lincoln have been worn by other men, but used without adornment, they are known to refer only to the Father of his Country and the savior of the Union.

In another column appears a letter from C. Carey Willetts on "Correspondence Teaching." It is in reply to a brief editorial in the *Herald* on "Bogus Degrees," but that article contained not one word of reflection on "correspondence teaching" or studies at home. On the contrary, it was explicitly stated that the "Correspondence University" had an honorable beginning, in that eminent educators devised the scheme in order to afford instruction in the higher branches to those unable to attend college. It only condemned the institution which confers a degree upon any ignoramus who can pay the ten, twenty or fifty dollars demanded, and likewise condemned by inference the man who would be willing to sport a degree so acquired. Barnum, the great showman, once remarked: "The world likes to be humbugged and that is why humbug pays so well." It undoubtedly does pay under some circumstances, and for a time, in the world's market, but a minister of the gospel who has to buy "his title clear" from a Correspondence University, rendering only a pecuniary equivalent, in order to command respect and influence, had better get out of the ministry and into some worldly profession where such devices are winked at as mere "tricks of the trade."

The Chautauqua course is a short-cut to the acquisition of much desirable knowledge, and the teaching is by correspondence. It does not assume to take the place of college drill, but to supplement the lack of other and better opportunities. There is no doubt that a bright, studious mind may derive more benefit from such a course than a dull youth dropped into a college hopper by parent or guardian and ground through. The Chautauqua school gives a certificate of what has been accomplished, and so very properly may any correspondence school, but when certain of these schools confer "for a consideration" the same degrees that are conferred by Yale and Harvard, and by our leading theological seminaries, we do not wonder that those who have received degrees "which mean something" should think themselves entitled to a statement of that fact.

Few of our leading colleges now confer the Master's degree "in course." A man must pursue post-graduate studies or win his spurs by some noteworthy literary work before his Alma Mater thus honors him. This is as it should be. Most German universities make doctors of divinity only of those who have published some important theological treatise. This degree has been cheapened in the United States, until the sight of it is liable to subject many of those who wear it most worthily to a fit of mental nausea.

GLADSTONE ON BIBLE STUDY.

From *The Lutheran Observer*, Philadelphia.

THE following letter from Mr. Gladstone has been addressed to the leader of a Men's Bible Class in Manchester: "It is wholly out of my power to reply to your letter in the manner which its purpose would recommend and its subject requires. But I am unwilling altogether to withhold a few words which may, at any rate, serve as an indication of sympathy with your desire to profit by the treasures of the divine Word. I will not dwell on the need of light from above, or the duty of seeking it, of being vigilant against the excuses of the private spirit, of cultivating humility, of bearing in mind that God has through all the long ages had a people whom He had led, that we are not the first who come to the wells of salvation opened by Christ and his apostles. I will assume that you are strict adherents of method in this great study, so as to make your results comprehensive. In this view, if you are churchmen, or indeed if you are not, I recommend you to consider whether the table of lessons, old or new, may not be of much use. Two things, however, especially I commend to your thoughts. The first is this—Christianity in Christ, and nearness to him and his image, is the end of all your efforts. Thus the Gospels, which continually present to us one pattern, have a kind of precedence among the books of Holy Scripture. I advise your remembering that the Scriptures have two purposes—one to feed the people of God on green pastures, the other to serve for proof of doctrine. These are not divided by a sharp line from one another, yet they are provinces on the whole distinct, and in some ways different. We are variously called to various works. But we all require to feed in the pastures and drink at the wells. For this purpose the Scriptures are incomparably simple to all those willing to be fed. The same cannot be said in regard to the proof or construction of doctrine. This is a desirable work, but not for us all. It requires to be possessed with more of external helps, more learning and good guides, more knowledge of the historical development of our religion, which development is one of the most wonderful parts of all human history, and in my opinion, affords also one of the strongest demonstrations of its truth and of the power and goodness of God."

RECENT GERMAN VIEWS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

BY REV. THOMAS S. POTWIN.

From *The Religious Herald*, Hartford, Conn.

DURING the last few months a controversy has sprung up which gives us in a nut-shell the latest phases of German opinion on the New Testament Canon.

Zahn of Leipsic is publishing a history of the New Testament Canon, and has issued the first half of the first volume with a kind of completeness by itself under the title of the *New Testament before Origen.* His position is that of the old and extreme conservatism, and he starts out with the thesis that the church has had from immemorial time "essentially the same New Testament as is printed to-day in Leipsic and Cambridge." He has not been careful to speak always respectfully of his opponents of the "scientific school."

Harnack, now of Berlin, seems to have regarded himself as challenged, and without waiting for any farther progress of the work, issued a critique of 112 pages upon this first part, in which in rather lofty style he holds up to ridicule what he considers Zahn's self-contradictions, evasions, etc., and lays down in successive sections what is the "Fact of the Matter;" and finally winds up with the assertion that Zahn's book is "no history but a dodging of history (Flucht vor der Geschichte"). This brought out a rejoinder from Zahn (Einige Bemerkungen) of 37 pages, in which, after adjusting himself slightly to his critic, and paying his respects to his style, he re-affirms his adhesion to his former opinions.

Harnack's view comes out near the close of his criticism, as that the New Testament is "a redaction of the collective early Christian literature including the Jewish apocalypses," and he makes a kind of key to the situation out of Tertullian's remark that "Everything edifying is inspired, and all that enforces Christ is to be accepted." He believes that in the exigencies of controversy with Montanism and Gnosticism certain writings of inferior or doubtful authorship were stamped with apostolic names to give them the needed authority.

He succeeds in convicting Zahn of inconsistencies and some special pleading in support of his thesis, but he might easily be convicted himself of like special pleading in his direction.

Fortunately there is little question about actual facts. The dispute is mainly over the significance of facts in that far away time and over possible inferential facts. It results that we can take what is conceded on both sides, look over the opinions of both and form conclusions for ourselves. And the comfortable thing about all this apparent diversion and discord is that what is really vital to our New Testament does not come into discussion at all save in a very feeble protest regarding the gospel of John.

The days of a *destructive* criticism of the New Testament are apparently well past. There only remains a dispute about books which might all be withdrawn from the New Testament without essentially changing its character or value, unless the attack upon Paul by Prof. Steck of Bern is to be seriously regarded. It is the epistle to the Hebrews, the general epistles and the apocalypse about which the battle rages. As Zahn's work goes on Harnack promises to follow him if he sees occasion, so that no one will be left in doubt regarding the different views that are possible of the various parts of the problem.

These two have fairly earned the right to be considered representative men. Zahn has given some twenty-five years to historical studies in early Christian literature, and has published among other things the Diatessaron of Tatian from an Armenian translation of a Syrian text. Harnack too has devoted his life to patristic literature, and has lately published a work of somewhat revolutionary character in Dogmatic History. He claims that a true history of the Canon will be a chapter of dogmatic history.

Sympathy among Christian scholars in this country will probably lean toward Zahn, but by all means read him with Harnack's "Prüfung" at your elbow.

CHEAP MISSIONARIES.

BY MEREDITH TOWNSEND.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), July, 1889.

THE broad controversy, whether Christian missions are worth the sacrifices made for them, is still going on, but is in its very nature sterile. The parties to it are too far apart to have any common ground on which to base an argument. No one who believes Christianity to be true can doubt that its diffusion is a duty, and no one who disbelieves it can regard its propagation as anything but an officious if not mischievous interference with the natural evolution of opinion about the unseen. There is no reconciliation possible between such a faith and such a denial on such a subject, and debate upon it becomes after a while not a little tedious. There is, however, a subordinate controversy about missions of grave importance, which rages among Christians themselves, which may at any moment affect the existence of the great Missionary Fund, and which already diminishes perceptibly the zeal of many Churches. When carefully examined, this controversy resolves itself into two definite main questions, which may be stated with brutal plainness thus: Are not missionaries, especially in India, made too comfortable, too like parsons *in partibus* instead of evangelists? and is not their devotion to English education, when considered as a means of spreading Christianity, a mistake from the beginning? I propose to say a few words upon each of these two questions, which, being intended to be placatory, will be doubtless dull, but which are still the words of an entirely detached but entirely friendly observer.

To begin with the facts. I have no means of discussing them over the whole field of missions, which includes regions like Polynesia and East Africa, where martyrdom is still a probable incident in any missionary's life, but in India the charge of comfortableness must in part be allowed. The majority of missionaries are as comfortable there as the majority of the Nonconformist clergy would be here, if they had to work hard all day for seven days in the week in a climate which worried and exhausted them. The missionary is allowed to marry, and almost invariably does marry, and he receives a salary, usually £300 a-year, which enables him to provide himself and his family with a modest house, a sufficiency of plain food, and as much domestic help as protects himself and his wife from wasting time and health in actual bodily labour. He is also able to provide some sort of conveyance, usually a most simple affair, costing about £18 a-year, without which his own journeys must be confined to a short radius or to the cold weather, and his wife could hardly obtain any fresh air at all. She cannot, in most places, take long walks unprotected, and, if her husband is a hard worker, who is to protect her? not to mention that the climate for eight months in the year almost forbids such walking to a woman the early hours of whose day must be devoted to household cares. It is impossible for a missionary to save money; it is impossible for him, unless assisted, to obtain a becoming education for his sons and daughters, who, if brought up in India, seldom turn out well; and it is most difficult for him in his old age, if the climate has impaired his powers, to retire, like other Europeans, to spend his last days at home and in peace. He may by possibility obtain a church, but if he does not he has no pension—though some missions give a small charitable allowance—he has no savings, and he must just work on in India, in a climate which to a worn-out European is torture, till he dies, leaving his wife and children, if they are not grown up, practically to charity. That lot will not strike many professional men as an enjoyable one, but still it is not, except as regards the children, much worse than that of the poorer clergy of all denominations. They also have little hope or none of professional advancement. They also find it hard to educate their children as they would like. They also have to live their lives scantily provided, and, owing to the difference of the climate and of prices, without the "luxury" of the "conveyance," which, however, we believe in America nearly every country minister tries to keep. It is now proposed, seriously proposed, to reduce this scale of comfort—that is, in fact, to put things in figures, to send out no missionary who will not consent to make an average of £100 a-year supply all his needs.

This proposal, too, finds favour in the Churches, and among most sincere men, for it appeals to two sets of feelings, one a noble one, and one rather ignoble, though intensely natural and human.

No one who has ever observed closely the method adopted by the Societies and Churches of raising the Missionary Fund, or who has studied the limitations placed on the distributing agencies in paying away that fund, will doubt that there exists among many most sincere and pious Christians, including clergymen, an operative jealousy, almost a dislike, of the mission cause. This jealousy springs from two causes, one obvious, one a little more recondite. The fund disposable for voluntary religious work and for charity is a strictly limited fund, which does not grow as it should in proportion to the national wealth, and which is subject to serious and sometimes almost inexplicable interruptions. Out of this fund the missionary demand cuts a huge cantle—I should myself say a fourth of the whole, but that depends on the meaning assigned to religious charity—and the loss is sometimes exceedingly annoying. It not only affects "works of mercy," but also ministers' salaries, which are, in too many of the Churches, most inadequate, and a constant cause of concealed bitterness and repining. This of itself makes any idea of "luxury," or even comfort, among missionaries unpleasing to those who, to speak plainly, are maintaining them, an unpleasingness further aggravated by the position assigned to missionaries in the opinion of the congregations. The missionaries are their heroes. Owing partly to tradition, partly to the occasional recurrence of martyrdoms, and partly to the excessive ordinariness of the English clerical life, the missionaries occupy a station in the imagination of the congregations higher than that of the regular pastors at home. They are held to be loftier figures, their adventures are more exciting, and their successes are more distinctly proofs that the spirit of the Lord is with them. There are churches and religious schools where the place of the heroes of history is directly taken by missionaries, and where any one who knows nothing of "the Martyr of Erromanga," or Bishop Hannington, is regarded either as an ignoramus or an infidel. Morally, in fact, the missionary caste is regarded as the Brahmin caste of the clergy—the best, the most tried, the most efficient. That is not pleasing to the snubbed even if they agree with the verdict, and when, therefore, the Churches are told by outside observers that missionaries in India are not martyrs at all, but very comfortable persons, who live in spacious houses and "drive about in pony traps," there is irritation, an unwillingness to ask for subscriptions, and a disposition to say that the annual reports create a deceiving impression.

This rather ignoble, though natural, feeling would not matter much, or would pass away on further inquiry, but that it is strengthened accidentally by a far nobler one. Protestant Christians have never, that I know of, accepted a rule of poverty as binding upon their clergy, or even as a counsel of perfection, but they have never rid themselves of the feeling that the ascetic life is better, holier, nearer the apostolic example, than the comfortable one. They hate bishops for their incomes, they think rich ministers anomalies, and they are inclined to make of poverty, especially startling poverty borne for Christ's sake, a splendid grace, and one, too, in manifesting which hypocrisy is impossible. There is not a Church in the country where this idea is not entertained by two or three of the most pious and most sincere, and naturally they apply it first of all to missionaries, who, they contend, would, if they rose to the level of their high calling, separate themselves at once from all the pleasantnesses of life. They should, such men think, be anchorites in all but seclusion, men careless of food or raiment, and indifferent even to health, living like the people they are to convert, or, if that is, for climatic reasons, impossible, accepting the lowest standard of life compatible with physical efficiency. A thousand men of this type, it is thought, would cost only a hundred thousand a year, and must make a grand impression even upon the closely packed millions of the Indian continent.

These two classes together, the enthusiasts for an idea and the jealous, make up a considerable body of opinion, all the more influential because the answer takes hold only on the experienced, and because the best evidence procurable, that of the whole body of Indian missionaries, is rejected *ab initio* as the evidence of interested persons. I have every respect for the opinion, which I recognize as thoroughly sincere, and which, if it were only well founded, would enormously increase the total volume of missionary agency ; but then it is not well founded, for three reasons. The Churches would not get their supply of missionaries at once efficient and cheap. The missionaries, if they did get them, would be no more effective than the present men, and the ideal which, in the circumstances of India, is the only one which can be profitably realized, would be finally laid aside. I will state what I mean by the third reason at the end of this article, but the other two are in truth conclusive by themselves. The Churches will not obtain their men because the cheap missionary must be a celibate, and the good missionary will not remain celibate. A young man of the missionary kind, that is a man, be his grade what it may—some of the best missionaries have been originally gentlemen, and some have been cobblers, miners, and loom-minders—who has in him the capacity of cultivation, who can learn one or two languages well, who can argue with Brahmins and not seem to them a fool, and who can guide men whose pivot of thought is not his own, may live, while he is in reality a student or an apprentice, on a hundred a year. He will not be of much use, and will probably convert nobody, but still he will be preparing himself to become efficient; but he will not marry. By the time his apprenticeship is over he will understand the conditions of Indian life, and will recognize that to ask an educated woman to share it with him on that income would be a hideous cruelty. For herself she would be simply a household servant in the tropics, the most unendurable of earthly positions, without good air, without domestic help, without good medical attendance, and without the respect of the people among whom her husband labours. They understand real asceticism perfectly well, and reverence it as a subjugation of the flesh, and if the missionary and his wife carried out the ascetic life as Hindoos understand it, lived in a hut, half or wholly naked, sought no food but what was given them, and suffered daily some visible physical pain, they might stir up the reverence which the Hindoo pays to those who are palpably superior to human needs. But in their eyes there is no asceticism in the life of the mean white, the Eurasian writer, or the Portuguese clerk, but only a squalor unbecoming a teacher and one who professes and must profess scholarly cultivation. Even if the cheap missionary could induce a fitting wife to share such a lot, he will think of the children to come, and perceives from examples all around him what on such an income their fate must be. They will be boys and girls with the white energy who have been bred up as natives—that is, they will, unless exceptional persons, belong to the most hopeless class existing in the world. They cannot be sent home or be kept in the hill schools, or be separated in any way from the perpetual contact of an Asiatic civilization which eats out of white children their distinctive *morale*. The missionary, if an able as well as a good man, will not run that risk, and also he will not remain unmarried. The moment his apprenticeship is complete, and the great cloud of language and habits, which at first separates him from Indians, has rolled away, he will not only wish to marry, but he will perceive that he must—that the people do not believe in celibacy unless it is to be lifelong and a matter of religious obligation, that he is distrusted and watched, and very often tempted almost beyond what he can bear. It is needless to enter into a detailed argument, or to show that a celibate life in the tropics is, for a great body of men who do not believe in celibacy, simply impossible; the opinion of the experienced ought to be sufficient, and that opinion is utterly fatal to any such scheme. The cheap missionaries will leave the service just when they become efficient, or rather their united remonstrances will compel the Societies and the Churches to remodel the new scheme, and, either by increasing allowances, or by paying house-rent, doctors' bills, and children's education, to restore the old and reasonable provision. Be it remembered, the cheap missionaries will have absolutely no special result to encourage them to persevere. A missionary is not made more efficient by being scarified every day with the squalid troubles of extreme poverty, and the notion that his low position will bring him closer to the native is the merest delusion. The white missionary is not separated from the Indian by his means, but by his colour, and the difference produced by a thousand years of differing civilizations which the word colour implies. He is a European; those to whom he preaches are Asiatics: in presence of that distinction all others are not only trivial but imperceptible. The effect of the cheap missionary on the native mind will be precisely that of the dear missionary, except that, as an unmarried man, he will be regarded with infinitely more suspicion and mistrust. Nothing, in fact, will be gained by the change, except the privilege of repeating an experiment which has been made half a dozen times, and has invariably failed.

On the second question, whether the missionaries are not in error in founding English colleges, I am on the reformers' side. Personally, every prejudice I have in the world would lead me to be against them. My Indian experience brought me mainly in contact with the tutor missionaries, and I learned to respect them as among the best and most efficient of mankind. I comprehend, I think, fully the arguments which swayed Dr. Duff, his belief that it was only from the intellectual classes that Christianity would slowly filter down, his confidence that increased intelligence of itself would predispose Asiatics towards a creed held by the masters of the world. I acknowledge that the tutor missionaries have been successful beyond all expectation; that they have turned out, and are turning out, a whole generation of men who, in intelligence and information, are at least the equals of the majority of English graduates. The pretentiousness of the Indian cultivated which so disgusts most Europeans in India seems to me quite natural, for the lads who display it are not at heart measuring themselves with the English cultivated but with their own uncultivated countrymen, who seem to them almost savages. Nor am I greatly concerned about the "disloyalty," which, to the consternation and amazement of the Government, is becoming a note of the Indians educated in English learning. The disloyalty is only a sign of ambition, natural enough to men who have emerged from intellectual darkness, and find all further progress stopped by the foreignness of their government. I note precisely the same symptoms among the students of Russia, and regard it as a disagreeable but inevitable symptom of a more vigorous intellectual life. Politically it does not matter one straw, for, if the English are true to themselves and their mission, they will go on reigning, and, if they are not true, they may as well be beaten by an insurrection of Baboos as by an insurrection of Sepoys. If we are to go away it matters nothing who sends us, for the Mahommedan will, in any case, revindicate his position; and, the British bayonet once withdrawn, will massacre the "educated natives" just as readily and just as easily as any other native opponents. So far as I can see, the tutor missionaries have succeeded in their enterprise of making scholars by the thousand, but then those scholars neither are nor will become Christians. The effect of English education in India, whether communicated through the Government colleges or the missionary colleges, is, like the effect of that torrent of sudden enlightenment which we call the Renaissance, to kill out spirituality altogether. A whole generation becomes in its own mind intellectually free, it is intoxicated with the sense of freedom, and it ceases to consider anything but earthly knowledge a matter of any importance. The educated natives, so far from accepting Christianity, think it as much a fetter on the free movement of the intellect as Hindooism is, and are proud to be as much in advance of their tutors as they are of their countrymen. Christian ideas and Hindoo ideas are both to them ideas of the populace, and they have left them miles behind. We see the same attitude of mind in Europe in our own colleges, and still more in those of the Continent, but with this considerable difference: men are governed as to their ethics in part by their creed, and in part by the social system amidst which they have been bred, and which, if the creed disappears, still exerts upon their minds an irresistible atmospheric pressure. In Europe this atmosphere is Christian, in India it is Hindoo. The educated native who disbelieves remains an Asiatic—that is, a man whose views of his duty to other men, of sexual morality, of true nobility of character, are essentially and permanently different from those of Europeans. This difference would exist in any case, but it is aggravated in India by two special conditions of life. The student leaves college at sixteen a married man, probably with one child born, united for life to a wife who influences him nearly as much, or quite as much, as a European wife influences her husband, but who has none of her husband's knowledge, none of his emancipation, and a strong suspicion and dislike of Christianity, which, as she sees clearly, would upset her social system altogether. Moreover, the educated native is under very singular bonds, and enjoys very singular liberties. If he openly quits Hindooism he is usually a ruined man, placed outside caste, shunned by his kinsfolk and his countrymen, as much a leper as an Irishman who has taken a farm from which the last tenant was evicted. His very wife will quit him, and his mother know him no more. It takes unusual social courage for a Hindoo to quit Hindooism, and at the same time there is no necessity for quitting it. Hindooism is a ceremonial creed, and if he will perform a few ceremonies, and abstain from a few articles of diet, the educated native can remain a Hindoo, and believe or disbelieve anything he pleases. He is in the position of the educated Frenchman, who, if he goes to confession once in five years and marries his daughter in church, is reckoned a Catholic, though his opinions all the while are those of Voltaire or even of d'Holbach. It was the belief of Dr. Duff that English literature, penetrated as it is with belief in the Christian code of morals and the Christian altruism, would of itself develop in the alumni of the colleges a new morality and a deeper sympathy with the suffering, but those results have not followed. Nobody in India believes educated Indians to be better than the old Indians of the same temperaments, and of the absence of altruism there is proof in the slight agitations raised for the reform of the more oppressive native customs. The educated natives are most zealous that all appointments should be thrown open to them, but not zealous that widows should be set free from their degraded position; most eager that the revenue should be distributed as they desire, not eager that the mass of the poor should be asked to contribute less. As for a general adoption of Christianity as the national faith, such as has flashed across the leading minds in Japan—leading minds which have not been trained in colleges—it never enters their heads. The system of tutor missionaries, in fact, has neither made Christians, though of course a few among the thousands taught have embraced Christianity, nor has it given to the class affected any general bias towards that faith. The students emerge from the colleges knowing all about Christianity, just as our own lads know all about the ancient Paganism, but with no more inclination to be Christians than the pupils of the French Lycées, who also are very well taught. As a mode of teaching certain branches of knowledge the system has succeeded, but as a method of evangelizing India it has failed, and always must fail. It does not even improve India, for the native, educated in that way through a foreign tongue, and by the use of foreign methods of thought, loses all originality, and devotes his whole intellectual energy to what is in reality a rather feeble imitation of the race which of all others is most separated in thought from himself. The result can be best illustrated by one single fact. The Bengalee, speaking his own language, is before all things a humorist, a man often of brilliant wit, always with a keen perception of the comic and the incongruous. A Bengalee writing English often seems incapable of even perceiving the ridiculous.

But if the missionary is not to be a preaching friar or a tutor, what ought he to be? I contend that there is for the white missionary in Asia—for this is as true of China as of India—but one natural place, that of the preaching bishop, using that word in its accurate, and not in its English sense. His business is to make, to inspire, and to guide native Christian evangelists. It is from these and these only that the Apostle can come who will make converts by tribes and nations, and pending his arrival they can do the work, which it is sought to have done through cheap missionaries, infinitely better. They have no languages to learn; they understand the thoughts as well as the utterance of their countrymen; they can rouse with their natural gift of poetic eloquence the enthusiasm for which the European sighs in vain. They are beginning to be counted in thousands, they do not cost one-fourth of the cheapest Europeans, and they have often a burning faith which puts that of ordinary Christians to shame. All they need is wise guidance, occasional stimulus, and, upon points, strict disciplinary control. That control need not last for ever, but at present it is indispensable. The native preacher, often to my mind an admirable man, and occasionally a most gifted one, has still the faults of all early converts, a tendency to hark back on old superstitions, a liability to moral weakness, especially as regards pecuniary affairs, a tendency to exaggerate morsels of Christian doctrine which might easily lead to a development of singular and dangerous heresies. Like the native judge, and the native soldier, and the native revenue officer, he needs still the help of the stronger European, who knows instinctively the problems which perplex him, and is, when the case is fairly before him, incapable of swerving. To my thinking the true white missionary is a man who is the head of a group of preaching natives, who confers with them every day, who perpetually stimulates their zeal, whose control, though not obtrusive, is always felt, who is the personal friend, the spiritual director, and the conscience of them all. I believe that such a man settling in any district of India for fifty years would do more to evangelize that district than a hundred white friars or a dozen English colleges, and I cannot see the sense of harassing him by reducing his wife into a servant and his children into the class of mean whites. There are seven hundred Protestant missionaries in India. Supply each of them with one hundred native preachers, costing, say, £1500 a year only for each group, and we have an evangelizing force of seventy thousand men, directed by able officers, fully acclimatized, with no language to acquire and no prejudices to unlearn, gifted with natural eloquence, and full of the zeal for the extension of the faith which belongs to early converts. That is the way to secure missionaries cheaply, not compelling cultivated white men to live like Portuguese clerks.*

---

* The reply to this article which appeared in the October number of *The Contemporary Review* will appear in our next issue.

II.

AGNOSTICISM.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

(Continued from the October number, p. 47.)

"Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man" (Mark v, 8),* are the words attributed to Jesus. If I declare, as I have no hesitation in doing, that I utterly disbelieve in the existence of "unclean spirits," and, consequently, in the possibility of their "coming forth" out of a man, I suppose that Dr. Wace will tell me I am disregarding the "testimony of our Lord" (*loc. cit.*, p. 255). For if these words were really used, the most resourceful of reconcilers can hardly venture to affirm that they are compatible with a disbelief in "these things." As the learned and fair-minded, as well as orthodox, Dr. Alexander remarks, in an editorial note to the article "Demoniacs," in the "Biblical Cyclopædia" (vol. i, p. 664, note):

> . . . On the lowest grounds on which our Lord and his apostles can be placed, they must, at least, be regarded as *honest* men. Now, though honest speech does not require that words should be used always and only in their etymological sense, it does require that they should not be used so as to affirm what the speaker knows to be false. While, therefore, our Lord and his apostles might use the word *δαιμονίζεσθαι*, or the phrase *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν*, as a popular description of certain diseases, without giving in to the belief which lay at the source of such a mode of expression, they could not speak of demons entering into a man, or being cast out of him, without pledging themselves to the belief of an actual possession of the man by the demons (Campbell, "Prel. Diss.," vi, 1, 10). If, consequently, they did not hold this belief, they spoke not as honest men.

The story which we are considering does not rest on the authority of the second Gospel alone. The third confirms the second, especially in the matter of commanding the unclean spirit to come out of the man (Luke viii, 29); and, although the first Gospel either gives a different version of the same story, or tells another of like kind, the essential point remains: "If thou cast us out, send us away into the herd of swine. And he said unto them, Go!" (Matthew viii, 31, 32).

If the concurrent testimony of the three synoptics, then, is really sufficient to do away with all rational doubt as to a matter of fact of the utmost practical and speculative importance—belief or disbelief in which may affect, and has affected, men's lives and their conduct toward other men in the most serious way—then I am bound to believe that Jesus implicitly affirmed himself to possess a "knowledge of the unseen world," which afforded full confirmation to the belief in demons and possession current among his contemporaries. If the story is true, the mediæval theory of the invisible world may be, and probably is, quite correct; and the witch-finders, from Sprenger to Hopkins and Mather, are much-maligned men.

On the other hand, humanity, noting the frightful consequences of this belief; common sense, observing the futility of the evidence on which it is based, in all cases that have been properly investigated; science, more and more seeing its way to inclose all the phenomena of so-called "possession" within the domain of pathology, so far as they are not to be relegated to that of the police—all these powerful influences concur in warning us, at our peril, against accepting the belief without the most careful scrutiny of the authority on which it rests.

I can discern no escape from this dilemma: either Jesus said what he is reported to have said, or he did not. In the former case, it is inevitable that his authority on matters connected with the "unseen world" should be roughly shaken; in the latter, the blow falls upon the authority of the synoptic gospels. If their report on a matter of such stupendous and far-reaching practical import as this is untrustworthy, how can we be sure of its trustworthiness in other cases? The favorite "earth," in which the hard-pressed reconciler takes refuge, that the Bible does not profess to teach science,* is stopped in this instance. For the question of the existence of demons and of possession by them, though it lies strictly within the province of science, is also of the deepest moral and religious significance. If physical and mental disorders are caused by demons, Gregory of Tours and his contemporaries rightly considered that relics and exorcists were more useful than doctors; the gravest questions arise as to the legal and moral responsibilities of persons inspired by demoniacal impulses; and our whole conception of the universe and of our relations to it becomes totally different from what it would be on the contrary hypothesis.

---

* Here, as always, the revised version is cited.

* Does any one really mean to say that there is any internal or external criterion by which the reader of a biblical statement, in which scientific matter is contained, is enabled to judge whether it is to be taken *au sérieux* or not? Is the account of the Deluge, accepted as true in the New Testament, less precise and specific than that of the call of Abraham, also accepted as true therein? By what mark does the story of the feeding with manna in the wilderness, which involves some very curious scientific problems, show that it is meant merely for edification, while the story of the inscription of the law on stone by the hand of Jahveh is literally true? If the story of the Fall is not the true record of an historical occurrence, what becomes of Pauline theology? Yet the story of the Fall as directly conflicts with probability, and is as devoid of trustworthy evidence, as that of the Creation or that of the Deluge, with which it forms an harmoniously legendary series.

The theory of life of an average mediæval Christian was as different from that of an average nineteenth-century Englishman as that of a West-African negro is now in these respects. The modern world is slowly, but surely, shaking off these and other monstrous survivals of savage delusions, and, whatever happens, it will not return to that wallowing in the mire. Until the contrary is proved, I venture to doubt whether, at this present moment, any Protestant theologian, who has a reputation to lose, will say that he believes the Gadarene story.

The choice then lies between discrediting those who compiled the gospel biographies and disbelieving the Master, whom they, simple souls, thought to honor by preserving such traditions of the exercise of his authority over Satan's invisible world. This is the dilemma. No deep scholarship, nothing but a knowledge of the revised version (on which it is supposed all that mere scholarship can do has been done), with the application thereto of the commonest canons of common sense, is needful to enable us to make a choice between its horns. It is hardly doubtful that the story, as told in the first Gospel, is merely a version of that told in the second and third. Nevertheless, the discrepancies are serious and irreconcilable; and, on this ground alone, a suspension of judgment, at the least, is called for. But there is a great deal more to be said. From the dawn of scientific biblical criticism until the present day the evidence against the long-cherished notion that the three synoptic gospels are the works of three independent authors, each prompted by divine inspiration, has steadily accumulated, until, at the present time, there is no visible escape from the conclusion that each of the three is a compilation consisting of a groundwork common to all three—the threefold tradition; and of a superstructure, consisting, firstly, of matter common to it with one of the others, and, secondly, of matter special to each. The use of the terms "groundwork" and "superstructure" by no means implies that the latter must be of later date than the former. On the contrary, some parts of it may be, and probably are, older than some parts of the groundwork.*

The story of the Gadarenes wine belongs to the groundwork; at least, the essential part of it, in which the belief in demoniac possession is expressed, does; and therefore the compilers of the first, second, and third Gospels, whoever they were, certainly accepted that belief (which, indeed, was universal among both Jews and pagans at that time), and attributed it to Jesus.

What then, do we know about the originator, or originators, of this groundwork—of that threefold edition which all three witnesses (in Paley's phrase) agree upon—that we should allow their mere statements to outweigh the counter-arguments of humanity, of common sense, of exact science, and to imperil the respect which all would be glad to be able to render to their Master?

Absolutely nothing.* There is no proof, nothing more than a fair presumption, that any one of the Gospels existed, in the state in which we find it in the authorized version of the Bible, before the second century, or, in other words, sixty or seventy years after the events recorded. And, between that time and the date of the oldest extant manuscripts of the Gospels, there is no telling what additions and alterations and interpolations may have been made. It may be said that this is all mere speculation, but it is a good deal more. As competent scholars and honest men, our revisers have felt compelled to point out that such things have happened even since the date of the oldest known manuscripts. The oldest two copies of the second Gospel end with the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter; the remaining twelve verses are spurious, and it is noteworthy that the maker of the addition has not hesitated to introduce a speech in which Jesus promises his disciples that "in my name shall they cast out devils."

The other passage "rejected to the margin" is still more instructive. It is that touching apologue, with its profound ethical sense, of the woman taken in adultery—which, if internal evidence were an infallible guide, might well be affirmed to be a typical example of the teachings of Jesus. Yet, say the revisers, pitilessly, "Most of the ancient authorities omit John vii, 53–viii, 11." Now, let any reasonable man ask himself this question: If, after an approximative settlement of the canon of the New Testament, and even later than the fourth and fifth centuries, literary fabricators had the skill and the audacity to make such additions and interpolations as these, what may they have done when no one had thought of a canon; when oral tradition, still unfixed, was regarded as more valuable than such written records as may have existed in the latter portion of the first century? Or, to take the other alternative, if those who gradually settled the canon did not know of the existence of the oldest codices which have come down to us; or if, knowing them, they rejected their authority, what is to be thought of their competency as critics of the text?

---

* See, for an admirable discussion of the whole subject, Dr. Abbott's article on the Gospels in the "Encyclopædia Britannica"; and the remarkable monograph by Prof. Volkmar, "Jesus Nazarenus und die erste Christliche Zeit" (1882). Whether we agree with the conclusions of these writers or not, the method of critical investigation which they adopt is unimpeachable.

* Notwithstanding the hard words shot at me from behind the hedge of anonymity by a writer in a recent number of the "Quarterly Review," I repeat, without the slightest fear of refutation, that the four Gospels, as they have come to us, are the work of unknown writers.

People who object to free criticism of the Christian Scriptures forget that they are what they are in virtue of very free criticism; unless the advocates of inspiration are prepared to affirm that the majority of influential ecclesiastics during several centuries were safeguarded against error. For, even granting that some books of the period were inspired, they were certainly few among many; and those who selected the canonical books, unless they themselves were also inspired, must be regarded in the light of mere critics, and, from the evidence they have left of their intellectual habits, very uncritical critics. When one thinks that such delicate questions as those involved fell into the hands of men like Papias (who believed in the famous millenarian grape story); of Irenæus with his "reasons" for the existence of only four Gospels; and of such calm and dispassionate judges as Tertullian, with his "*Credo quia impossibile,*" the marvel is that the selection which constitutes our New Testament is as free as it is from obviously objectionable matter. The apocryphal Gospels certainly deserve to be apocryphal; but one may suspect that a little more critical discrimination would have enlarged the Apocrypha not inconsiderably.

At this point a very obvious objection arises and deserves full and candid consideration. It may be said that critical skepticism carried to the length suggested is historical pyrrhonism; that if we are to altogether discredit an ancient or a modern historian, because he has assumed fabulous matter to be true, it will be as well to give up paying any attention to history. It may be said, and with great justice, that Eginhard's "Life of Charlemagne" is none the less trustworthy because of the astounding revelation of credulity, of lack of judgment, and even of respect for the eighth commandment, which he has unconsciously made in the "History of the Translation of the Blessed Martyrs Marcellinus and Paul." Or, to go no further back than the last number of this review, surely that excellent lady, Miss Strickland, is not to be refused all credence because of the myth about the second James's remains, which she seems to have unconsciously invented.

Of course this is perfectly true. I am afraid there is no man alive whose witness could be accepted, if the condition precedent were proof that he had never invented and promulgated a myth. In the minds of all of us there are little places here and there, like the indistinguishable spots on a rock which give foothold to moss or stone-crop; on which, if the germ of a myth fall, it is certain to grow, without in the least degree affecting our accuracy or truthfulness elsewhere. Sir Walter Scott knew that he could not repeat a story without, as he said, "giving it a new hat and stick." Most of us differ from Sir Walter only in not knowing about this tendency of the mythopœic faculty to break out unnoticed. But it is also perfectly true that the mythopœic faculty is not equally active on all minds, nor in all regions and under all conditions of the same mind. David Hume was certainly not so liable to temptation as the Venerable Bede, or even as some recent historians who could be mentioned; and the most imaginative of debtors, if he owes five pounds, never makes an obligation to pay a hundred out of it. The rule of common sense is *prima facie* to trust a witness in all matters in which neither his self-interest, his passions, his prejudices, nor that love of the marvelous, which is inherent to a greater or less degree in all mankind, are strongly concerned; and, when they are involved, to require corroborative evidence in exact proportion to the contravention of probability by the thing testified.

Now, in the Gadarene affair, I do not think I am unreasonably skeptical if I say that the existence of demons who can be transferred from a man to a pig does thus contravene probability. Let me be perfectly candid. I admit I have no *a priori* objection to offer. There are physical things, such as *tæniæ* and *trichinæ,* which can be transferred from men to pigs, and *vice versa,* and which do undoubtedly produce most diabolical and deadly effects on both. For anything I can absolutely prove to the contrary, there may be spiritual things capable of the same transmigration, with like effects. Moreover, I am bound to add that perfectly truthful persons, for whom I have the greatest respect, believe in stories about spirits of the present day, quite as improbable as that we are considering.

(To be continued.)

GOODLY WORDS.

Selected by Mr. C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

THE GIFT OF GOD.

"Poor Sinner! consider the Treasure thou hast within Thee, the Saviour of the World, the eternal Word of God lies hid in Thee, as a Spark of the Divine Nature, which is to overcome Sin and Death, and Hell within Thee, and generate the Life of Heaven again in thy Soul. Turn to thy Heart, and thy Heart will find its Saviour, its God within itself. Thou seest, hearest, and feelest nothing of God, because thou seekest for Him *abroad* with thy outward Eyes, thou seekest for Him in Books, in Controversies, in the Church, and outward Exercises, but *there* thou wilt not find Him, till thou hast *first* found Him in thy Heart. Seek for Him in thy Heart, and thou wilt never seek in vain, for there He dwelleth, there is the Seat of his Light and Holy Spirit. For this turning to the Light and Spirit of God within Thee, is *thy only true* turning unto God; there is no other Way of finding Him, but in that Place where he dwelleth in Thee. For though God be everywhere present, yet He is only present to Thee in the deepest, and most central Part of thy Soul. Thy natural *Senses* cannot possess God, or unite Thee to Him, nay thy inward Faculties of *Understanding*, *Will* and *Memory* can only reach after God, but cannot be the *Place* of his Habitation in Thee. But there is a *Root*, or *Depth* in Thee, from whence all these Faculties come forth, as Lines from a *Center*, or as Branches from the Body of the Tree. This Depth is called the *Center*, the *Fund* or *Bottom* of the Soul. This Depth is the *Unity*, the *Eternity*, I had almost said, the *Infinity* of thy Soul, for it is so infinite, that nothing can satisfy it, or give it any Rest, but the Infinity of God. In this *Depth* of the Soul, the Holy Trinity brought forth its own living Image in the first created Man, bearing in Himself a living Representation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and this was his Dwelling in God and God in him. This was the Kingdom of God *within* Him, and made Paradise *without* Him."

THE PEARL OF ETERNITY.

"*First*, it is the *Light* and *Spirit* of God within Thee. . . . . When Man first came into Being, this *Light* and *Spirit* of God was as *natural* to him, as truly the Light of his Nature, as the *Light and Air* of this World is natural to the Creatures that have their Birth in it. But when Man, not content with the Food of Eternity, did eat of the earthly Tree, this Light and Spirit of Heaven was no more *natural* to him, no more rose up as a Birth of his Nature, but instead thereof, he was left solely to the Light and Spirit of this World. And this is *that Death*, which God told *Adam*, he should surely die, in the Day that he should eat of the forbidden Tree.—The Bruiser of the Serpent brought Light and Spirit of Heaven *once more* into the human Nature; [but] not as it was in Paradise, but as a *Treasure hidden* in the Center of our Souls, which should discover, and open itself by Degrees, in such Proportion, as the *Faith* and *Desires* of our Hearts were turned to it. This Light and Spirit [. . . . lying in the Soul is] as a *secret Source* of Heaven, [and] is called *Grace, Free Grace*, or the *Supernatural* Gift, or Power, of God in the Soul, because it was something, that the Natural Powers of the Soul could no more obtain. . . . . *Secondly*, this Pearl of Eternity is the *Wisdom* and *Love* of God within Thee. In this Pearl of Thy Serpent Bruiser, all the Holy Nature, Spirit, Tempers, and Inclinations of Christ lie as in a Seed in the Center of thy Soul; and divine Wisdom and heavenly Love will grow up in Thee, if thou givest but true Attention to God present in thy Soul. It is there as an *Holy Oil*, to soften and overcome the wrathful fiery Properties of thy Nature, and change them into the humble Meekness of Light and Love. It is there as a *speaking Word* of God in thy Soul, and as soon as thou art ready to hear, this eternal speaking Word will speak. . . . . *Thirdly*, this Pearl of Eternity, is the *Church*, or *Temple* of God *within Thee*, the consecrated Place of Divine Worship, where alone, thou canst worship God in *Spirit, and in Truth*. . . . . Accustom thyself to the Holy Service of this inward Temple. In the midst of it is the Fountain of Living Water, of which thou mayest drink, and live forever. There the Mysteries of thy Redemption are celebrated, or rather opened in Life and Power. There the Supper of the Lamb is kept. . . . . There the Birth, the Life, the Sufferings, the Death, the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, are not merely remembered, but inwardly found, and enjoyed as the real States of thy Soul, which has followed Christ in the Regeneration. *Fourthly*, and *Lastly*, This *Pearl* of Eternity is *Peace* and *Joy* of God within Thee, but can only be found by the Manifestation of the Life and Power of Jesus Christ in thy Soul. But Christ cannot be thy Power and thy Life, till in Obedience to his Call, *thou deniest thyself, takest up thy daily Cross*, and *followest* Him, in the Regeneration."—William Law, The *Spirit of* Prayer; or the Soul Rising out of the Vanity of Time into the Riches of Eternity, 3d ed., London, 1752.

MEMORY AFTER DEATH.

. . . .

I've prov'd, and shew'd she* is not very God;
But yet a decent *Deiformity*
Have given her: thus in the middle trod
I safely went, and fairly well have row'd
As yet. Part of my voyage is to come,
Which is to prove that the souls new aboad
In heaven or hell (what ever is her doom)
Nought hinders but past forms even there again may bloom.

Which if they did not, she could never tell
Why she were thus rewarded, wherefore ill
Or good she doth enjoy, whether ill or well
She lived here. Remembrance death did spill.

. . . .

This faculty† is very intimate
And near the Centre, very large and free,
Extends it self to whatsoever that
The soul peracts. There is no subtilty
Of Intellect, of Will, nor Phantasie;
No Sense, nor uncouth strange impression
From damned Night, or the blest Deity,
But of all these she hath retention,
And at their fresh approach their former shapes can own.

This memorie the very bond of life
You may well deem. If it were cut away
Our being truly then you might contrive
Into a point of time. The former day
Were nought at all to us; when once we lay
Our selves to sleep, we should not know at morn
That e're we were before; nor could we say
A whit of sense: so soon as off we turn
One word, that's quite forgot. Coherence thus is torn.

Antimonopsychia *or* the fourth part of the *Song of the* Soul. By H. M. (Henry More.) Cambridge, 1647.

---

* The soul.

† Memory.

PARAGRAPHIC.

In Cardinal Gibbons' recent pastoral letter he treats at some length the recent glorification of Giordano Bruno. There are many who will agree with him when he says that the throngs who attended the unveiling of the statue in the Campo dei Fiori meant "not so much to honor Bruno as to insult and vilify the Vicar of Christ," *i.e.*, the pope. So let it be. No one nowadays adheres to the philosophy of Bruno and the late popular demonstration was merely a protest against the infallible authority that burned him alive. The unchangeable papacy would likewise wish, if it were consistent, to burn Wallace and Huxley, not to speak of Herbert Spencer.

Without agreeing with these eminent men there are thousands who would vindicate them under persecution, and even erect a statue to them, not because they were Christians, but because they were sincere and conspicuously successful in searching for truth along certain intellectual lines. In their department they have served the best interests of the world.—*Churchman.*

The Power of a Picture.—In the chapel of the Women's Prison at Sherborn there is a striking picture of Christ standing before the woman taken in adultery. The light beaming from His face, the pose of His figure, the outstretched hand, seem to utter a benediction of hope over the prostrate woman. Beneath it is written, "Go and sin no more." A few years ago, one evening when the women were dismissed after prayers, one remained in her seat. She was one of the worst to manage of all the prisoners. The matron, supposing some new trouble was brewing, went and asked what was the matter. The woman, with her eyes fixed on the picture, said, "I want to go into the solitary cell." "Why," said the matron, "what do you mean? You have just had to spend a week there." "I want," said the woman, "to go and be alone where I can think about Him that is in that picture."

She went into solitary confinement, remained a week, came out to serve the rest of her sentence with a deportment that called for no criticism, and, since leaving the prison, has lived an upright life. If the painter of that picture could get on canvas an expression of Christ of such power, cannot we get the same into our lives and faces? The ability to inspire those who have lost faith in themselves with faith in the reality of a holy life, and the hope of gaining it, is worthy to be sought as an art and coveted as the highest gift.—*The Congregationalist.*

A Crank on Burglars.—Hugh O. Pentecost, the former Congregational minister of Newark, N. J., preaches a sort of anti-poverty gospel with Dr. McGlynn and Henry George—that is to say, when he is not quarrelling with them on some visionary point. On the last Labor Day he made a speech at New York, and is reported to have said:

"If I knew a burglar was in my house at night, I would go to him unarmed, and talk to him as I would to a friend whom I desired to help. If he then desired to take my goods, I would make no protest, but would follow him to the door, and invite him to call again."

The Norristown *Herald* is equal to any emergency in the crank line, and he seconds Mr. Pentecost's transcendental philanthropy in the following style:

"That's the right sort of Christian spirit. Too often when a man hears a burglar in his house, instead of going downstairs and being friendly with the intruder, and helping to pack up the silverware and things, he becomes panic-stricken, grabs his revolver, and discharges half a dozen shots at random, one of which wounds his wife, another goes through a mirror, and the remainder lodge in the walls, if there are no other innocent persons in the house to perforate. Such conduct is calculated to make the burglar so shy, that instead of calling again, he will honor a neighbor with the next professional visit." See Prov. xxvi. 5.—*The Lutheran Observer.*

A Biblical Opinion of Man.—Wife: "The Bible says much in favor of women, John. I thought that the Israelites kept their women in the background, but if they did, the Bible, which is their history, doesn't."

Husband: "Humph! The Israelites did well by keeping their women in the background; that's where woman should be."

Wife: "But still the Bible says that—"

Husband: "Oh, I know there are a few women mentioned in the Bible—there was Jezebel, she was a woman."

Wife: "Yes; and there was Ahab, he was a man. And there was—"

Husband: "It is no use talking, Mary. The Bible is a history of men. Women are mentioned only incidentally as they had influence on the actions of men. The book says little about women compared to what it does about men!"

Wife (musingly): "You may be right, John, now when I come to think of it. There is one thing, at any rate, it says about men that it does not say about women."

Husband (smilingly): "I thought you would come to your senses, Mary. What is it the book says about men that it does not say about women?"

Wife (placidly): "It says all men are liars."

Then the husband arose and put on his hat and went out to see what kind of a night it was.—*The Independent Methodist.*

A Collection for Solomon.—Dr. Mutchmore, the editor of the *Presbyterian*, has been making a journey around the world. He thus describes a form of persecution to which he was subjected: "There are some things in every life which are perplexing and inexplicable. In our tour, in nearly every church where we preached or worshipped which had a choir of some pretensions, it gave us the piece, 'Consider the Lilies,' and in song, bold and flighty, told us five or six times that Solomon was 'not arrayed.' For the first two or three times we did not consider the gravity of the matter, but finally became a little restive over Solomon's condition, when it was repeated and emphasized in moderate tones, in tenderness and in high-sounding tones, in trills, in shrieks, that 'Solomon was not arrayed;' and what was more embarrassing, the singers sometimes looked and bowed to us, as if we were to blame for it. When we reached San Francisco, we thought, this will end this Solomon business. We supposed that it was a favorite in the East because he had his bringing up there; but, to our amazement, we heard it in three churches in the Occident as well as Orient, that 'Solomon was not arrayed.' In the East there was appropriateness in it, where nobody is much arrayed. But when we heard again in Saratoga, on different occasions, that 'Solomon was not arrayed,' from four to six times right along, and in a manner that could leave no doubt, and when significant movements of the head were made at us, we felt that it was time that something should be done without fail. Let a collection be taken up for Solomon."—*The Christian Register.*

WHAT THE MAGAZINES FOR OCTOBER CONTAIN.

Harper's opens with a poem by Lucy Larcom. Next comes a beautifully illustrated article on the "Forests of the California Coast Range," by Fred. M. Somers. "The Fair of Nijnii-Novgorod" is the subject of another article. This fair is a survival of a remote period. It is not what it used to be, is far less cosmopolitan, yet it retains some features of interest. The article on "Hierapolis and its White Terrace" carries us into Bible-land, for it deals with the territory mentioned in Coloss. 4:13. The famous White Terrace of Hierapolis would alone be worth a journey to see. It reminds one of pictures of the similar formation in New Zealand, which was destroyed by the terrible earthquake of 1887. But Hierapolis is full of archæological interest, as the text and illustrations amply prove. Passing over the poetry and the fiction and other articles of this number, we find two of religious interest—"The Building of the Church of St. Denis," by Charles Eliot Norton, and "A Peculiar People," by Howard Pyle. The former article gives us a glimpse into the very busy life of a mediæval abbot, Suger, abbot of St. Denis, and friend of Louis the Fighter, alas ! to be better known as Louis the *Fat*. It was he who rebuilt the abbey-church. Mr. Pyle has laid us under obligation by portraying for us by pen and pencil the Dunkers or Tunkers. They are indeed a peculiar people, and their neighbors, the German Seventh-day Baptists, still more so. It seems very strange that right in the midst of the great State of Pennsylvania, so full of "modern improvements," there should exist to-day such unworldly, simple and primitive people. Yet he who would study a curious form of Christianity, with its kiss of charity, its feet washing, its separation of the sexes in worship, its voluntary celibacy, has only to go a little way from Lancaster. Prof. W. G. Blaikie, D.D., writes about "A Corner of Scotland worth Knowing," and, incidentally, the game of golf. The "corner" is North Berwick. The illustrations are numerous. The Editor's Easy Chair contains one of the graceful essays Mr. Curtis knows so well how to write. This time his theme is Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge's biography of Washington. The remaining departments of this Magazine are filled as usual.

Scribner's, unique among the rivals in popular favor in that it has no editorial department of any kind, transports us to Africa in its first article. Mr. Joseph Thomson writes "How I Crossed Masai-land." He does not encourage other persons to do it. Incidentally he raps Stanley and Bishop Hannington, "who unhappily following my footsteps, and utterly disregarding my warnings and advice, marched with incredible rashness to the fate which befell him, a few miles west of my farthest point" (p. 403). One of the illustrations is of the northeast corner of Lake Victoria Nyanza, near where Bishop Hannington was murdered. The article, "Electricity in War," illustrated, is in two parts, treating of naval and land warfare respectively. Human ingenuity has been able to do wonders of late both in the destruction and preservation of life. It is reassuring to reflect that the probability continually grows less that these terrific engines of destruction will shortly be used in actual war. Mr. Charles Sprague Smith writes on "A Summer in Iceland." 'The two most distinct impressions made upon the stranger's mind during the earlier period of his sojourn are, first, the physical inertia of the ordinary Icelander, and second, his hospitality." The former is attributed to his poverty and neglect of sanitation. Leaving Reykjavik he lived with a rural dean. He gives a pleasing picture of their family life. His journey closed with a trip through its southern part. One of the illustrations, that of the Fall of the White River, deserves special mention. Mr. Edward J. Lowell gives us "The Life of Benvenuto Cellini," an illustrated article. He remarks that "as a sculptor Benvenuto still proves himself a goldsmith. The pedestal of the Perseus, with its bas-relief and its four little statues, is admirable jewelry." Mr. Donald G. Mitchell sends "A Scattering Shot at some Ruralities;" and other writers give us stories and poems.

Lippincott's has these contents : "Creole and Puritan," by T. C. De Leon (a complete story of 122 pp.) ; an appreciative article on "The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley," by S. B. Wister ; "An Influence" (a poem of two verses), by John B. Tabb ; "The Trials of Magazine Editors," by Junius Henri Browne (an instructive article, which should be read by the army of non-professional writers who are so desirous of appearing in print ; "My Hero" is a little poem of eight lines, by Ellen Seawell ; "Banzou Jean" (a quaint story of one who lived on Lake Borgne, one of the chain between Lake Pontchartrain and the Gulf of Mexico), by Maurice Thompson. "If" (a poem of four verses), by Mary Ainge De Vere ; "What Shall be our National Flower ?" (a vote for the golden-rod), by Anne H. Wharton. The rest of the number is made up of miscellaneous matter.

The Century.—The striking face of Molière, in stage costume, looks at us as we open the magazine, and begin reading another instalment of Mr. George Kennan's powerful but sad articles on Russia. That for the current month is on some "East-Siberian Silver Mines," worked by convicts. It makes one's blood boil to read his quiet, simple, graphic narrative. The places in which the unhappy convicts sleep and work are unutterably bad. Of one of their prisons he writes : "As a place of confinement, even for the worst class of offenders, it was a disgrace to a civilized state, and the negligence, indifference, and incompetence shown by the Government in dealing with its admitted evils were absolutely inexcusable." The poor convicts are the victims of a system of organized corruption. Mr. Kennan does not hold the Czar personally responsible for their bad treatment. Red tape and official plunder are the main causes of it. But one would think that there might be at least an effort to make things better. It is odd to come across a picture of *camels* grazing, in an article on Siberia in winter. M. C. Coquelin discourses on "Molière and Shakspere." He has a Frenchman's proper admiration of Molière, and makes a number of discriminating remarks. "Baseball—for the Spectator," by Mr. Walter Camp, brings before us by pen and picture the joys and the dangers of the national game. Next comes an instalment of Messrs. Nicolay and Hay's life of Lincoln, taking in Blair's Mexican project, the Hampton Roads conference, and the XIIIth Amendment. The curtain will soon fall on that noble life. "In Sorrow's Hour," a poem by Lizette Wordsworth Reese, precedes "Fra Filippo Lippi" by the competent hand of Mr. W. J. Stillman. Mr. Cole's engraving of Lippi's "The Virgin Adoring the Infant Christ," is admirable. "Three Jewish Kings," by Mr. Edward L. Wilson, relates incidents from the lives of Saul, David, and Solomon in connection with views of localities in the Holy Land. The article is particularly interesting to Bible students, and is a good specimen of the appplication of the Land to the Book. Mr. Henry Jerome Stockard writes some verses "Over their Graves"—not those of the three Jewish kings just mentioned. A very modest or timid person, who does not admire them, writes the tenth article on "The Pretty Girls in the West," and gives a specimen. Mr. Robert Underwood Johnson rhymes "On a Great Poet's Obscurity." Can he mean Browning ? "The Longworth Mystery," by Mr. Young E. Allison, is fiction. "Compensation," by Mr. Stuart Sterne, is verse. So is "Songs of Ireland," by Jennie E. T. Dowe. Mr. Maurice Thompson tells an amusing and instructive story about "Ben and Judas." Mr. William Young's verse puts "Phryne in Hades." Many think she deserved to go lower. "Maria Mitchell's Reminiscences of the Herschels" is an interesting account of a visit paid Sir John Herschel in 1857. Mr. J. C. Harris continues his story, "The Old Bascom Place." Alice Wellington Rollins, in her poem, "Sunrise," thinks that sufferers raise sweeter hymns of thanks for the dawn than those who get up to see the sun rise. "The Training of the Teacher," by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler ; Mr. Francis Newton Thorpe's "Manual Training as a Factor in Modern Education," and Mr. Felix Adler's "The Democratic Ideal in Education," are three illustrated articles deserving attention. Mr. H. S. Sanford, Jr., devotes seven lines to "Illusions." Mr. G. W. Cable edits "The War Diary of a Union Woman in the South." Louise Imogen Guiney writes some verses "To a Dog's Memory." No one would imagine that they were addressed to a dog if the title did not say it. The departments, "Topics of the Time," "Open Letters" and "Bric-à-brac" take the usual range.

The Atlantic has "The Begum's Daughter," a serial story, by Edward Lasetter Bynner ; "A Non-combatant's War Reminiscences," by Rev. Dr. J. R. Kendrick ; "The Monmouth and Newport Campaigns," by John Fiske ; "Prismatics," by Sophia Kirk ; "The Closing Scenes of the Iliad," by William Cranston Lawton ; "In the Harara" (poem), by Clinton Scollard ; "Dave's Neckliss," a story by Charles W. Chesnutt ; "The Government and its Creditors," by Henry Loomis Nelson ; "Sunset" (poem), by Mary Colborne-Veel (the companion piece to Alice W. Rollin's "Sunrise" in the *Century*) ; "Ladies and Learning," by L. D. Morgan ; "Fiction in the Pulpit" (not, as might be supposed, on the clerical use of fiction, but on the tendency of novelists these days to do some more or less superfluous preaching in their novels), by Agnes Repplier ; "The Plaint of the Rose" (poem), by John B. Tabb ; "The Tragic Muse" (serial story), by Henry James ; "Theodore Dwight Woolsey. Reminiscences," by Joseph Henry Thayer ; "The Butterflies of the Eastern United States," "The Beginnings of New England," "The Contributor's Club," and the "Books of the Month," are four unsigned articles. Dr. J. R. Kendrick was pastor in Charleston when the war broke out, and had therefore an excellent opportunity of seeing things from the inside, and it was well he wrote out his reminiscences. We cannot have too many such publications. This article matches that written by another non-combatant in the *Century*. Professor Fiske tells the good story, that when that "unmitigated brute," the British Major-General, Prescott, was being conveyed a prisoner through Connecticut, he got his dinner one day at Lebanon, in the inn of Captain Alden. On the table was put a dish of succotash, "whereupon Prescott, not knowing the delicious dish, roared out, 'What do you mean by offering me this hog's food?' and threw it all upon the floor." It is satisfactory to learn that Captain Alden horsewhipped him for that performance. Mr. Lawton prints original translations of the latter books of the Iliad. Mr. Nelson writes of the delayed payment of Mr. Piatt's just claim against the government, and other equally disgraceful treatment by Congress of those who had claims. L. D. Morgan writes entertainingly upon the vagaries of men in respect to the amount of learning a woman could or should carry. Professor Thayer informs us that it was Dr. Woolsey's influence as a reviser which led to the adoption of the form Quirinius instead of Quirinus in Luke ii. 2, and the translation of Matt. xxvi. 50 as it now stands in the Revised Version.

CONCISE DICTIONARY
OF
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

REV. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, M.A.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

REV. TALBOT WILSON CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D.,

Of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York City,

AND

REV. FRANK HUGH FOSTER, PH.D.,

Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio.

[THIS DICTIONARY WAS BEGUN IN THE OCTOBER NUMBER AND WILL BE CONTINUED IN THE SUCCESSIVE NUMBERS, FIVE HUNDRED PAGES APPEARING WITHIN THE YEAR.]

NEW YORK:
THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY.
1889.

THE

MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1. DECEMBER, 1889. No. 3.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

REDEMPTION AFTER DEATH.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, N. Y. CITY.

THE time has fully come when Protestant Churches are compelled to confront the question of the Middle State and the nature of Christian life therein. This crisis is due: (1) to an entire change of attitude toward the Second Advent of Jesus Christ; (2) to the spread in the churches of the Arminian doctrine of probation; (3) to the general acceptance of the new doctrine of the universal salvation of infants; (4) to the development of the doctrine of sin and guilt in connection with a further unfolding of Philosophical Ethics and a deeper study of Christian Ethics. In these four directions Protestantism and especially Calvinistic Churches, have departed a long distance from the Creeds of the Reformation and the Confession and Catechisms of Westminster.

I. Limiting the Love of God.

The doctrine of the Middle State depends chiefly upon the doctrine of redemption. All mankind are born into this world in a condition of sin and ruin. All need redemption. Redemption is born of the love of God. God is love. The love of God is the well-spring of election, predestination unto life, and all the acts and works of God for the accomplishment of the redemption of man. It is a doctrine of scholastic Protestants that divine sovereignty is the source of the election. Some of these scholastic divines have gone so far in their subordination of the divine love to the divine sovereignty, that they have pushed the love of God and the compassion of the heavenly Father behind the justice of the judge and the good pleasure of the sovereign; and thereby have come close to the unpardonable sin of limiting the grace of God and denying the power of the Divine Spirit. A genuine Protestantism, such as we find in the creeds of the Reformation, teaches that God's election is an election of grace. The grace of God is so vast and inexhaustible that we may assume that God will redeem a larger number of our race than any man could suppose. God's love and power to save are infinitely greater than the love and redemptive yearnings of all creatures combined.

The love of God works redemption through Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world, and through the Holy Spirit, who imparts the new life and growth without which salvation is impossible; and also through the paternal superintendence and government of the Heavenly Father. The redeemed consist, therefore, of those who belong to the elect of God, who have been purchased by Jesus Christ and who have been born of the Holy Spirit. The redeemed consist of the elect only. There can be no redemption that does not originate in the election of grace; in the love of the Heavenly Father's heart. The Reformers and Puritans apprehended the love of God and magnified the divine grace in election and predestination. That is the reason they made so much of these high doctrines. They also emphasized the doctrine of forgiveness of sins, which is so closely related to the doctrine of the divine grace. Scholastic divines, when they substituted sovereign election for the election of grace, divided mankind into two classes, those predestinated unto life and those predestinated unto everlasting death, and thus made both classes dependent upon the good pleasure of the will of the sovereign, without regard to their actual sins or acceptance of the provisions of redemption. As a natural result of this theory the mass of mankind were doomed to everlasting perdition in hell fire, and only a few were snatched from the burning. These scholastic divines also substituted God the Judge for God the Father, and accordingly overlooked the Fatherhood of God and abandoned the doctrine of forgiveness of sins. The supreme forms of this scholasticism were the supralapsarian theory, that made the decree of election and preterition prior to the decrees of the creation and the fall of man, and the kindred Antinomian theory, that made justification eternal and entirely independent of human faith and repentance. Such scholasticism had no need of a Middle State between Death and the Day of Judgment. It is hard to see what need there was of life in the present world. It is difficult for this theory to explain why God did not send men to heaven and hell at once in accordance with his arbitrary and eternal decree, which has no respect to life in this world and life after death, without requiring them to undergo a life and death which have no effect whatever upon their eternal welfare. Antinomianism has ever been regarded as a heresy. It was a sad mistake that supralapsarianism was not placed with Antinomianism in the catalogue of heresies. The repute of a few distinguished divines, who maintained it, ought not to have restrained the Church from branding their error with the stigma it deserves.

God's love is a love that is eternal in its origin. It is also everlasting in its outgoings toward God's creatures. It is a love prior to time and above and beyond all time, but it is also a love that enters into time and pervades all time. If we have a real apprehension of the Living God and of the Fatherhood of God we cannot doubt that the divine love is a living and unfolding love, and that it assumes the form of parental love that never forsakes the child from his birth onward through all the ages of his growth, even to the end. From this point of view, if life in this world is brief and life in the Middle State is long, we must rise to the conception of the love of God as accomplishing even greater works of redemption in the Middle State than in this world. The Roman Catholic Church has ever had this conception. Its doctrine of purgatory has a powerful influence upon the religious life in this world, and upon the entire system of Roman Theology. Protestantism, when it threw overboard the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, also threw away with it much of the ancient Catholic doctrine of the Middle State. It magnified the love of God in the grace of election and forgiveness of sins in this life, but did not trace the workings of the divine grace in the Middle State.

II. The Living God.

Protestantism, however, laid hold of the doctrine of the Living God, and found vital union with Him in redemption, and, in this respect, overcame the abstract ideas of God that governed the Roman Church. This doctrine of the Living God was abandoned by Protestant scholastics. Dr. Isaac Dorner again brought it into prominence, and it is becoming fruitful in a living theology. This doctrine is important for the unfolding of the Middle State. Those who are in vital relations with the Living God can never die. They live on beyond the gate of death ; they live the life of God, in communion with God. Such a life, hid in this world with Christ, there manifests itself in its richness and fulness. It unfolds from one degree of glory into another. What wonders of redemption are wrapped up in life with God ! What infinite possibilities are within the reach of that being whose life is begotten of God, and whose life has no other end or aim than the transcendent experience of divine sonship and the supreme blessedness of God-likeness !

III. Narrow Views of Redemption.

Protestantism was at fault in taking too narrow a view of redemption. It was necessary to magnify justification by faith and carefully separate it from sanctification and glorification, but it was a mistake to lay such stress on justification and faith that sanctification and love were thrown into the background, and this to such an extent that some divines had the assurance to teach that good works were hurtful to salvation. This narrowing of the original base of the Reformation was the chief reason why Staupitz and other evangelical men preferred to remain in the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome still maintains a more comprehensive view of redemption than is common in Protestant Churches. Her fault is that she does not distinguish and properly define justification and sanctification. Protestantism defined justification, but left sanctification in a very uncertain condition. The Puritan Reformation unfolded the doctrine of sanctification and defined it as a progressive work of God, but did not define its appropriating instrument. It laid stress on the importance of sanctification in this life. It saw that sanctification must be completed in the Middle State, but it left this subject in such an obscure form that it has been the general opinion in Calvinistic Churches that sanctification was completed at the very moment of death.

IV. Judgment at Death.

This interpretation was favored by the scholastic divines, who coined the doctrine of a judgment at death which assigns to heaven or hell or purgatory. This doctrine of a judgment at death has no warrant in the Scriptures or in the creeds of Christendom. It is not only unsupported by Scripture and the Symbols, but it violates them all; for it throws the day of judgment into the background, robs it of its place and importance in the Christian system and in religious experience, and applies many passages of Scripture that belong only to it, to the judgment at death, and so makes death the supreme issue.

Furthermore, the doctrine of a judgment at death is a heathen doctrine derived from the heathen mythological conception of a god of the realm of the dead. It was taken up by the scholastic divines of the Middle Ages, and borrowed from them by the Protestant scholastics. It does violence to the doctrine of Scripture and the creeds, that the human race had its probation in Adam, and when he fell was judged in him and condemned to death and the abode of the lost. The heathen doctrine of a judgment at death throws both the original judgment and the final judgment into the background, and puts a crisis in a false place in the history of redemption.*

V. The Second Advent.

Furthermore, the attitude of Theology, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, has been changed toward the great crisis of the Second Advent and the Day of Judgment. The doctrine of the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Church in all its Creeds and Liturgies is that the Advent is imminent. This is expressed in that wonderful hymn, *Dies Iræ*. But in the eighteenth century two errors, that were revived by the Anabaptists and a few isolated scholars, gained a rapid supremacy in the Theology of the Protestant Churches. The one of these is the Premillenarian doctrine. This separated the advent of the Messiah by a thousand years from the last judgment. It retained the church doctrine of the imminency of the Advent, but pushed the divine judgment into the background. The other error was still more serious, for it postponed the second Advent as well as the judgment until after the Millennium had been completed, and thus antagonized the doctrine of the Church as to the great crisis. This latter opinion has so prevailed in the nineteenth century, that it has been regarded as orthodox, owing to its advocacy by leading divines in the British and American Churches.*

Both of these serious errors should be banished, with the doctrine of a particular judgment at death, as all alike contrary to the Scriptures and the Creeds; and as obstructions to the development of a Biblical and Historical Theology. The Millennium of the Scriptures and of the Fathers is not an object for our future expectation. The Church has already enjoyed that experience and is enjoying it now. The Millennium of popular conception is a conceit without support in the Scriptures or in the Creeds. The crisis that we are to look forward to, long for, watch for, and pray for, is the Advent of our Lord in glory and judgment at the end of the age, to glorify his saints and perfect his kingdom. In modern Eschatology the Millennium has usurped the place of the Middle State.

VI. The Means of Grace.

The Roman Catholics teach that the divine grace is imparted by the sacraments of the Church. Accordingly, all who have not enjoyed these sacraments are excluded from heaven, and also from purgatory. The Lutherans teach that the grace of God is imparted by word and sacraments. It is difficult for the Lutheran to extend redemption beyond the bounds of the Christian Church and the use of the means of grace. The Reformed Churches teach that the divine grace is not limited to the ordinary means, and hence the Divine Spirit may work apart from the Church and its ordinances, and so it is possible to conceive that the Kingdom of God is more extensive than the visible Church. But the question still remains, How may the divine grace be appropriated by the person to be redeemed?

The Protestant Reformation made an important advance in the History of Doctrine by its definition of *Justification by Faith only*. This is the banner doctrine of Protestantism, the doctrine by which the Church stands or falls. The Roman Catholics confound justification and sanctification. They make sanctification the product of the sacraments of the Church in this life. It is appropriated by the use of the sacraments. It is carried on in the Middle State by purgatorial fires. The Protestants separated justification from sanctification, and represented that justification was appropriated by *faith alone*, and not through the bare use of the sacraments. They taught that sanctification was the fruit of justification, but they did not carefully define it. It is the merit of the Puritan Reformation that it defined sanctification, repentance, and the doctrines related to them. These doctrines were considered in their relation to this life and the ultimate state, but were not applied to the Middle State.

---

* See Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 195 *seq.*, 1889, Charles Scribner's Sons.

* Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 200 *seq.*

Calvinism remained indifferent to the question of the Middle State, because it was content to leave all to the electing grace of God.

VII. Probation.

But Arminianism and Semi-Arminianism could not be so indifferent. Daniel Whitby first formulated the doctrine of Probation in this life, in his attack upon the Five Points of Calvinism; and Bishop Butler gave it currency among all the opponents of English Deism, so that it has been largely appropriated by Calvinists, and has in many respects warped Calvinistic Theology.*

The doctrine that this life is a probation calls attention to the fact that it is so in fact only to a very small portion of our race. And if the redemption of a part depends on their use of their probation, how can those be saved who have no probation at all? It seems necessary, therefore, to extend probation for these into the Middle State, or to give the vast majority of mankind over to the devil. Accordingly, Whitby taught the annihilation of the wicked,† and Butler consistently held to the extension of probation into the future life.‡ Other probationists must either follow their example or else abandon the doctrine of probation altogether. Arminians and Semi-Arminians must in the end take one of these two alternative courses.

Arminians and Semi-Arminians, who are in our churches, and who believe in the doctrine of probation, must face this question. If probation is to be extended to the Middle State, they must in some way conceive of the gospel extending into Hades, for it is difficult to see any possibility for regeneration there without it. Several theories have been proposed to overcome this difficulty.

(1) Some think that when our Saviour preached to the imprisoned spirits he organized those whom he saved into a church, and left them in Abaddon with a commission to preach his gospel to the lost. This is not in itself impossible. It might be said that such a mission would be so difficult and exacting, that it is hard to believe that the Saviour would lay it upon any of his redeemed. And yet I cannot help the thought that there have been and are to-day Christians who would be willing to go into the depths of Abaddon to glorify Christ and save souls. How much more, those who may have been redeemed by Christ in Abaddon itself might regard it as a privilege to labor for him in this prison of the lost!

(2) It has been conjectured that hypocrites and others, who know the gospel, but have no saving experience of it here, may recall it there and be saved by it, and in this way become the preachers of Hades. In that ingenious book, *Letters from Hell*, the author suggests that hypocritical priests and people assemble in church on the sabbaths in Hell as was their habit in this world, and that they are tormented by not being able to recall the gospel to their minds. It seems to me that it is far more likely that the larger portion of them would remember it. Such a paralysis of the memory is unpsychological. The lost are not to be imbeciles or madmen.

And it is not incredible that a considerable portion of the Bible might be recovered from the memories of those who go thither. This is certainly true if the current opinions in the Christian Churches are true, that all Heretics and Jews are sent there. A Hades full of Protestants, as the Romanists think, could hardly be without the Gospel. A place of torment where Roman Catholics are found by the hundreds of millions—popes, archbishops, monks, nuns, and all, could hardly be in such terrible ignorance of Christ and his Word. The Old Testament, with its Messianic promise, could hardly pass from the minds of all Jews. Even Unitarians, Universalists, and German Rationalists might reasonably recall some of those passages of the New Testament that contain in them the sum of the gospel, and are called by Luther little Bibles. In this case we would have to ask whether the gospel could lose its power there; whether it would be deprived of the influence of the Divine Spirit, and finally, whether all those who have gone there have become so hardened as to be incapable of faith and repentance?

(3) It has been generally thought by the advocates of an extension of redemption to the abode of the lost, that the Saviour might commission some of the redeemed of this world to preach his gospel there. It is true this would be a difficult and hazardous work for any man to undertake. It is true that there was an impassable gulf that Abraham and Lazarus were not allowed to cross. But this did not prevent our Saviour from crossing that gulf during his ministry to the

---

* Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 217 *seq.*
† Commentaries, II. Thess., p. 391, ed. 1710.
‡ Analogy, I. 13, II. 6.

underworld, and it does not exclude the possibility that he might bridge that chasm for the heralds of redemption in his wondrous love for lost souls. It is conceivable that he may have done this. But it is without any warrant from Holy Scripture and must remain pure conjecture. The difficulty lies not in the inability of the Messiah to send, or in the readiness of preachers to go, but in the feasibility of the work itself.

Many in the early Church thought this work feasible. The Shepherd of Hermas represents the apostles and martyrs as carrying on the preaching of Christ in Hades. And, indeed, what man is there, who has a spark of heroism, who would not rather work for Christ among the lost in Hades, if there were any possibility of such a work, than to pass centuries in a dreamy state of existence in Paradise, or live a life of ease and selfish gratification in the heights of heaven? Far better to work in Sheol than idle in heaven. The current views of the state of blessedness are unethical and demoralizing. They have little attraction for men of intellect and power, or for souls on fire with love to Christ and eager for the redemption of men. If we cannot serve our Saviour in heaven better than on earth, there is little to attract us after death. But thanks be unto God, we know that we may glorify him in the better world. We may share the aim of Paul, that whether in heaven or on earth we may be well-pleasing to Him. There are inexhaustible treasures of redemption that we may appropriate for ourselves, and that we may share in distributing to others.

All such theories of redemption of lost souls after death are castles in the air. No one can put any confidence in them. They have no solid ground on which to rest. They are not so dangerous as some would have it; they do not convince any one; they cannot disturb the real faith of the Church. They may unsettle those who see the crisis for mankind in the event of death. And they will render real service if they should destroy this error altogether.

They may expose the weakness of the current Eschatology. They may thus be a blessing in disguise. For the real faith of the Church, as expressed in the creeds of Christendom, looks forward, now as in the ages of the past, not to the day of death or a millennium, but to the Second Advent of the Messiah and his day of judgment, when He will make the final decision that will issue in everlasting ruin to some wretched creatures but in everlasting bliss to the human race as a whole.

VIII. *Salvation of Infants.*

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Lutheran, Anglican, and Reformed National Churches, the entire population belonged to the Church by baptism, and the great majority by partaking of the Lord's Supper. The National Churches took entire possession of their respective countries, and either banished, reduced to submission, imprisoned, or put to death dissenters. The conception of the everlasting death of children did not spring into the mind of theologians or the people, except so far as they were involved in the everlasting damnation of the heathen. This was taken as a matter of course. But in those days there was little contact with the heathen, and the mind of men was not impressed with this awful fact. There were a few theologians, such as Zwingli and Cœlius Secundus Curio, who held that the grace of God extended to the heathen. But at that time theology did not confront the problem.

The development of Puritanism in the seventeenth century and the origination of a large number of sects in Holland and Great Britain, such as Anabaptists, Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians, Universalists, Arminians, and the new circumstances that arose, disclosing thousands and millions of unbaptized children in Christian lands, forced the question of the salvation of unbaptized children upon the attention of theologians. Furthermore, the result of the religious conflicts in Great Britain and Holland produced a large class of men and women who declined communion with the churches in the way of sacrament. The strict rules of the dissenting churches, excluding all but those who would comply with their rules, and changing the churches into a multitude of religious clubs, increased the number of the population who did not belong to the Church and were not professing Christians. This forced the ministry to consider whether these men and women, many of them leading upright lives, were to be damned in Hell forever. In the eighteenth century these matters came before the mind and heart of Christians as never before. The result of these things has been a gradual change of opinion on these subjects, and the recognition of the universal salvation of infants and the admission that men may be saved who are not in communion with the Church.

The present century brought the Church of Christ face to face with the heathen world. Hundreds of millions of heathen stand over against nominal Christians half their number. The latter must be reduced by multitudes who are inhabitants of Christian lands, but who do not profess the faith of Christ. It is safe to say that there are not one hundred millions on the earth to-day who comply with the methods of salvation taught in Christian Churches. The damnation of these millions of heathen, who have never heard of Christ, and millions of nominal Christians, who do not use the means of grace offered them by the Church, is an awful fact for the Church to confront after nearly two thousand years of Christianity on the earth. The ministry and the people do not really believe that these multitudes will be damned. The matter is eased a little by the theory that the dying infants of the heathen are saved, and some of the best of heathen adults may attain redemption; but the great mass of the adult population of Asia and Africa—yes, of Europe and America also—are doomed to hell-fire according to the popular theology. The ministers preach it, and the people listen to this doctrine as they do to many others, but they are not moved by it. They accept it as orthodox doctrine without understanding it; but they do not really believe it in their hearts. If they did they would be more worthy of damnation than the heathen themselves. If a single man were in peril of physical death, the whole community would be aroused to save him. No price would be too great. Men and women would cheerfully risk their lives to save him. Those who would not do this would be regarded as base cowards. But here, according to the average missionary sermon, are untold millions of heathen perishing without the gospel, and at death going into everlasting fire. Vast multitudes of unevangelized persons in our cities and towns and villages are confronting the same cruel destiny.

If the ministry and people really believed it they would pour out their wealth like water; they would rush in masses to the heathen world with the gospel of redemption. There would be a new crusade that would put the old crusades to shame. Those who have the gospel, and will not give it to others who know it not, may incur a worse doom in the day of judgment than the ignorant. Those who knew the Lord's will and did it not will be beaten with many stripes; those who knew not and did things worthy of stripes with few stripes. *

The difficulty is to construct the doctrine of the salvation cf infants and the heathen in harmony with established doctrines.

The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith implies that there can be no salvation without justification on the part of God and faith on the part of man. The Westminster doctrine is that,

> "God did from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification; nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them" (xi. 4).

This passage not only teaches the common Protestant doctrine of justification and connects it with the doctrine of election, but it also rules out the Antinomian doctrine of eternal justification without faith, which was current in the time of the Westminster Assembly. The Westminster divines did not think of any application of Christ apart from personal faith; for they distinctly state:

> "Redemption is certainly applied, and effectually communicated, to all those for whom Christ hath purchased it; who are in time by the Holy Ghost enabled to believe in Christ, according to the gospel" (Larger Catechism, Ans. 59).

Believing in Christ is therefore universal so far as the elect of God and the redeemed of Christ are concerned. There is no salvation without personal faith.

The Westminster divines were not clear in their views as to the faith of infants and incapables. Some supposed that the children, being bound in the covenant with their parents, the parents' faith laid hold of justification for their children; others supposed that the germs of faith and repentance were planted in them by the Holy Spirit in the work of regeneration either in connection with Baptism or apart from it.

No orthodox Protestant thought of justification without the exercise of personal faith on the part of the justified. There must be an application of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit to every one to be saved, and there must be a personal appropriation of Jesus Christ on the part of all who are redeemed. The order of Salvation is necessary in all its parts for every child of God.

> "Those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth" (xi. 1). (*Westminster Confession of Faith.*) "All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth, in and for his only Son, Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption" (xii. 1). "They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are farther sanctified really and personally" (xiii. 1). "They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved" (xvii. 1).

There is but one way of salvation for all, one *ordo salutis*. There is but one kind of justification, one kind of sanctification, one kind of saving faith, and one kind of repentance unto life. The modern extension of the doctrine of redemption so as to include not only infants of believers, but all infants; and also so as to embrace not only the people of God under the Old Covenant and the people of God who accept the New Covenant, but also multitudes from among the heathen, who have not the light of either of these covenants, but only the light of nature, raises the question how these can be saved consistently with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith and the Puritan doctrine of sanctification. It is evident that the orthodox divines of the seventeenth century constructed their systems of doctrine without any conception of such an extension of redemption. The theory of some modern theologians, such as the elder and younger Hodge, that they may be saved without personal faith, subverts the fundamental principle of Protestantism. The current unformulated theory that they can be saved without acceptance of the righteousness of Christ undermines the fundamental principle of Christianity. Christians are not saved in classes or masses, but as individuals out of the mass of corruption. It is anti-Christian to say that the entire race of men may be regarded as redeemed, unless it is expressly said that they are lost. On the contrary, the Bible and the Creeds teach that all are lost unless they are personally redeemed and experience the work of grace. There must be some way in which infants, incapables and pious men beyond the bounds of Christendom may be brought into contact with God and His Christ, and have an opportunity to believe in him, or they cannot be saved in accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures and the creeds of Christendom. Unless this can be done Protestantism—yes, the entire system of Christian doctrine, breaks down.

---

* Luke xii. 48.

The fault of modern Protestantism has been in neglecting the doctrine of salvation as a whole, with its *ordo salutis*, and in thinking too exclusively of the initial steps. Justification by faith was too exclusively in the minds of the early Protestants, and regeneration is unduly prominent in American Protestant Theology since the rise of Methodism, having taken the place of the older doctrine of Effectual Calling. It is not difficult to understand that the Divine Spirit may regenerate all the elect in this world, and plant within them the seeds of faith and repentance, so that redemption may have its beginning here for infants and incapables. We may also see this faith and repentance germinate and spring up under the light of nature, and feel after God and His Christ in many among the heathen; but the redemption thus begun must in some way bring them to Christ in order that they may have the possession and enjoyment of salvation.

From the Arminian doctrine of probation and of human responsibility for the initiation of redemption, the first steps of regeneration must take place in the Intermediate State for all these persons or not at all. But from the Calvinistic position, which makes the divine grace prevenient, it is easy to hold that every elect person is actually regenerated in this life before he leaves the world. It seems that the birth of little children into this world would have no significance if they were not to have their regeneration here also. They must be born as children of Adam to take part in the ruin of the race, and it would seem that only the children of Adam have a share in the Saviour of the race. From this point of view Calvinism ought to have no hesitation in advancing into the doctrine of the Middle State. The salvation which is begun here by regeneration is carried on there. For the vast majority of our race who die in infancy or have lived beyond the range of the means of grace, their salvation begun in this life by regeneration is carried on in the Intermediate State with the exercise of personal faith in Christ, whom they know there for the first. There the germs of faith and repentance that have been put in their hearts in regeneration by the Holy Spirit spring up in the sunlight of Christ's own face, and lay hold of him as their Saviour. Not till then are they justified, for there can be no justification without faith for them any more than for others. The Intermediate State is for them a state of blessed possibilities of redemption. This is beautifully expressed in a hymn of Ephraim, the Syrian, translated by Professor Gilbert:

> "Our God, to Thee sweet praises rise
> From youthful lips in Paradise;
> From boys fair robed in spotless white,
> And nourished in the courts of light.
> In arbors they, where soft and low
> The blessed streams of light do flow:
> And Gabriel, a shepherd strong,
> Doth gently guide their flocks along.
> Their honors higher and more fair
> Than those of saints and virgins are;
> God's sons are they on that far coast,
> And nurselings of the Holy Ghost."

The Intermediate State is, therefore, for a considerable portion of our race a state for the consummation of *their justification*. The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone forces to this position.

IX. *Progressive Sanctification.*

But justification by faith belongs to the earlier stages of redemption. All those who are justified are also sanctified. No one can be ultimately and altogether redeemed without sanctification.

It is necessary that believers should have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and that they should be "more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," and "so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." The doctrine of immediate sanctification is a heresy which has always been rejected by orthodox Protestants.

The Westminster Confession definitely states: "This sanctification is throughout, yet imperfect in this life." If imperfect in this life for all believers, there is no other state in which it can be perfected save in the Intermediate State. The Intermediate State is therefore for all believers without exception a state for *their sanctification.* They are there trained in the school of Christ, and are prepared for the Christian perfection which they must attain ere the judgment day.

I am well aware that it has been a common opinion that believers are at their death —that is, in the very moment of death, completely sanctified. This opinion seems to be favored by the statement of the Shorter Catechism—"The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness." (Quest. 37.) This is one of a number of instances in which the Shorter Catechism by its brief, unguarded statements has occasioned error. The Larger Catechism is fuller and clearer when it says: "The communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible church enjoy immediately after death, is in that their souls are then made perfect in holiness, and received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory." (Quest. 86.)

The phrase "immediately after death" is the phrase of the question: "What is the communion in glory with Christ which the members of the invisible church enjoy *immediately after death?*" and it is designed to cover the *entire period* of the Intermediate State as distinguished from the state of resurrection, and it is not limited to the moment after death, in which the Intermediate State has its beginning. This is clear from Question 82, where the general question, "What is the communion in glory which the members of the invisible church have with Christ?" is answered in the following three divisions of condition, which appear in three questions that follow: "The communion in glory, which the members of the invisible church have with Christ, is in this life, immediately after death, and at last perfected at the resurrection and day of judgment." It ought to be clear to any one that, having made sanctification a work of God's grace and a growth extending through the entire life of the believer and left incomplete at death, and that, having denied the doctrine of immediate sanctification, the Westminster divines could not be so inconsistent as to teach that at the moment of death, occurring at various stages in the growth in holiness, sanctification then changed its nature, ceased to be a progressive work, a growth, and became immediate, an act of God like justification. This would be to undermine the Protestant doctrine of sanctification. It is essential to the integrity of the Protestant system of faith that we should resist the Antinomian doctrines of eternal justification without faith and of immediate sanctification at any time or in any state or place.

There are some theologians who persuade themselves that they can believe in the immediate justification and the immediate sanctification of infants, of incapables and of heathen adults in the change of death, in that supreme moment of transition from this life to the Middle State. Such a theory may be stated in words, but it is inconceivable in fact. What a transformation would take place in the intellectual and moral powers of infants, incapables and the dark-minded heathen! Such a metamorphosis is not taught in the Scriptures or the Creeds. It would violate the intellectual and moral constitution of man.

Those who believe it may claim that all things are possible to God. But it might be said that it is just as possible for God to use the water of Baptism, *ex opere operato,* to work regeneration, as Sacramentarians believe; and it is just as possible that the elements of the Lord's Supper may be changed into the real body and blood of our Lord, as the Roman Catholics believe. These divine transformations are just as possible to God and just as credible to the mind of man as the immediate transformation of a little babe into a perfectly holy man in the image of Jesus Christ; or of the instantaneous accomplishment of the entire *ordo salutis* for an idiot in the very moment of death. All such magical doctrines are subversive of the entire structure of Protestantism. They belong to an age of magic, and have no place in an age of Reason and Faith.

It was a keen thrust of Möhler that Protestantism without a purgatory must either let men enter heaven stained with sin, or else think of an immediate magical transformation at death, by which sin mechanically and violently falls off from us with the body. Hase justly replied that Protestantism would not accept this dilemma, and that Protestant Theology taught that the divine grace was operative. and men capable of moral development after death. This view is the established opinion in German Theology. Dorner, Martensen, Kahnis, and other divines teach that there must be a growth in sanctification in the Middle State. All Protestants must accept this doctrine or they are sure to be caught in the inconsistency of magical, mechanical and unethical opinions. This opinion is commonly held by Protestants in Great Britain. Why should Protestants in America lag behind their brethren in Europe ? We have been caught in the snares of recent errors. Let us break through the snares and re-establish ourselves in the ancient Christian doctrine of the Middle State.

The deeper ethical sense in German Theology since Kant forced divines to distinguish grades of sin and guilt and punishment, and to study as never before the psychological origin of sin and its development in human nature. Attention was thus called to the words of Jesus that the sin against the Holy Spirit was the only eternal sin, the only unpardonable transgression. This sin is not only unpardonable in this age, but also in the age to come. This raises the question whether any man is irretrievably lost ere he commits this unpardonable sin, and whether those who do not commit it in this world ere they die are, by the mere crisis of death, brought into an unpardonable state ; and whether, when Jesus said that this sin against the Holy Spirit was unpardonable here and also hereafter, he did not imply that all other sins might be pardoned hereafter as well as here. This conclusion was reached by Nitzsch, Tholuck, Julius Muller, Martensen, Dorner, Schaff, and many others.

The doctrine of immediate justification and sanctification at death involves the conceit that the child who dies in infancy a few moments after birth is immediately justified and sanctified, receives saving faith and all the Christian graces in an instant ; while his brother, who lives in this world, is not justified until he reaches the age in which he can exercise personal faith, and then he has all the struggles of life to undergo until he reaches the limits of human life without the comforts of sanctification, which he cannot receive until death. If this were so, then blessed are those who die in infancy, and thus outstrip their fellows in the Christian race. Vastly better to be born to die, than to be born to live in this uncertain world. What parent would not prefer to lay all his children in an early grave, assured of their salvation, rather than expose them to the dreadful risks of life and the possibility of eternal damnation? According to the current beliefs, those Chinese mothers who put their children to death make more Christians than all the missionaries.

Overcome with such reflections, we might express our misery in the complaint of Job,

" Why died I not from the womb ?
Why did I not give up the ghost when I came from
the belly ?
Why did the knees receive me ?
Or why the breasts, that I should suck ?
For now would I have lain down and been quiet,
I would have slept ; then had I been at rest."

The Christian doctrine of sanctification forces us to the conclusion that the Middle State is now and has ever been the school of Christian Sanctification. The Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory is a perversion of the true doctrine. It is mechanical and unethical, like other peculiar doctrines of the Roman Catholic system. But it is better than a blank agnosticism. There is much truth and some comfort in the midst of its errors, and it has profound consolation to offer to the bereaved and penitent. Here is one of its greatest strongholds. It is less mechanical and less unethical than the theory that has prevailed among Protestants that there is both immediate justification and immediate sanctification in the article of death.

The doctrines associated with Christian sanctification lead to similar results. Are the experiences of saving faith, assurance of grace and salvation, religious worship, the communion of saints confined to a few adult Christians in this life ? Have they no meaning for the vast majority of the redeemed ? Rather for the best of Christians the sublime truth and comfort involved in these doctrines are not realized until they enter upon the Middle State.

Those who hold the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death do not really understand the Protestant doctrine of sanctification and the principles of Christian Ethics.

Regeneration is an act of God and from its very idea is instantaneous, for it is the production of a new life in man. Regeneration is only one of the terms used in the New Testament to describe this beginning of Christian life. Resurrection is more frequently used. Creation is also employed. Effectual Calling was preferred by the Westminster divines. All these terms indicate a divine originating act. Regeneration is always such, and cannot be otherwise.

But sanctification is the growth of that life from birth to full manhood, to the likeness of Christ. It is always in this world a growth; it is incomplete with the best of men at death. Does it change its nature then? Shall the little babe, the idiot, the seeker after God among the heathen, the Roman Catholic, the Protestant, and the saints of all ages, all alike in an instant leap over this period of growth, however different their stage of progress may be? Shall a babe become a man in an instant? Shall a savage become a philosopher in a moment? Shall a little boy become a John Calvin, and a John Calvin be conformed to the image of Christ, all at a divine creative word? Then the difference between regeneration and sanctification has disappeared for the vast majority of the redeemed.

If regeneration and sanctification are one act, how can we distinguish the intervening act of justification; and if regeneration, justification, and sanctification may all be one at death, why not in this life, as the Plymouth brethren teach? Why was the world turned upside down at the Protestant Reformation in order to discriminate justification by faith from sanctification if, after all these centuries of Protestantism, they are really identical for the vast majority of our race, and are only to be distinguished in those in Christian lands who live to maturity and become true Christians? Then Protestantism would be not only a failure, but also one of the greatest crimes in history. This is the pit of ruin into which the dogmatic divines of our day would force us rather than extend the light of redemption into the Middle State.

Those divines who confound sanctification with justification do not understand the principles of sanctification and Christian Ethics. Sanctification has two sides—mortification and vivification; the former is manward, the latter is Godward. Believers who enter the Middle State enter sinless; they are pardoned and justified; they are mantled in the blood and righteousness of Christ; and nothing will be able to separate them from his love. They are also delivered from all temptations such as spring from without, from the world and the devil. They are encircled with influences for good such as they have never enjoyed before. But they are still the same persons, with all the gifts and graces and also all the evil habits of mind, disposition, and temper they had when they left the world. It is unpsychological to suppose that these will all be changed in the moment of death. It is the Manichean heresy to hold that sin belongs to the physical organization, and is laid aside with the body. If this were so, how can any of our race carry their evil natures with them into the Middle State and incur the punishment of their sins? The Plymouth Brethren hold that there are two natures in the redeemed, the old man and the new. In accordance with such a theory, the old man might be cast off at death. But this is only a more subtile kind of Manicheism, which has ever been regarded as heretical. Sin, as our Saviour teaches, has its source in the heart, in the higher and immortal part of man. It is the work of sanctification to overcome sin in the higher nature. We may justly hold that the evil that lingers in the higher moral nature of believers will be suppressed and modified with an energy of repentance, humiliation, confession, and determination that will be more powerful than ever before, because it will be stimulated by the presence of Christ and his saints. The Christian graces will unfold under more favorable circumstances than in this world. If it were possible that sanctification at death would make men so perfect in holiness as to remove all evil tendencies and habits, and not only destroy their disposition to sin, but so lift them above temptation that they would be not only like our Saviour during his earthly life, *posse non peccare,* but also like our Saviour after he had sanctified himself and risen victor over sin, death, and Satan, and attained the position of *non posse peccare;* even then they would only have accomplished the negative side of sanctification, the mortification or entire putting to death the old man of sin. They would still have to undergo the process of vivification and learn the *practice* of true holiness. What practice have infants and imbeciles when they enter the Middle State? How far short in practice do the best of men fall? Are they no longer to have an opportunity for the practice of true holiness? Will there be no chance to learn what true holiness is? The Middle State must, from the very nature of the case, be a school of sanctification.

X. The Reigning Christ.

It was a profound saying of Henry B. Smith that Eschatology ought to be Christologized. It is greatly to be regretted that he did not turn his own attention to that theme, and give us the fruit of his investigations. Dr. Schaff gave his attention to this subject many years ago in his book on the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and has added not a few valuable hints in his later publications.

Christ is the mediator between God and man in the exercise of his offices as prophet, priest and king. Those who passed a few years in this world, and then went into the Middle State and have been there for centuries, have not passed beyond the need of his mediation. The interval between death and the judgment has its lessons and its training for them as well as for us. The prophetic office of Christ continues to those who are in the Middle State. After his own death he went to the abode of the departed spirits, and preached unto them his gospel. He ascended into heaven, taking his redeemed with him. All those whom he has purchased with his blood ascend to him to abide with him. The redeemed robber is not the only one to whom he has something to say in the Middle State. All believers enter his school and are trained in the mysteries of his kingdom. Those mysteries are not cleared up by a flash of revelation; they are revealed as the redeemed are able to apprehend them and use them. It is improbable that Augustine, Calvin and Luther will be found in the same class-room as the redeemed negro slave or the babe that has entered heaven to-day. The Fathers and doctors of the Church will be the teachers of the dead, as they taught the living.

Christ's priestly office continues for them. They who enter the Middle State still need his blood and righteousness. Even if they commit no positive sin they do not reach positive perfection until their sanctification has been completed in the attainment of the complete likeness of Christ. They need the robe of Christ's righteousness until they have gained one of their own. He is still their surety, who has engaged with them and with God to present them perfect in the last great day.

But, above all, Christ is a king in the Intermediate State. Here in this world his reign is only partial; there it is complete. Here his kingdom is interwoven with the kingdom of darkness. There it is apart from all evil and hindrance. His reign is entire over his saints, and they are being prepared by him for the advent in which they will come with him to reign over the world.

The Church is chiefly in the Intermediate State. The Church on earth is only the vestibule of it. In this world we have learned to know in part the Messiah of the Cross; there in the Middle State the redeemed know the glory of the Messiah of the Throne. There the Church is in its purity and complete organization, as the bride of the Lamb. There Christ the head and his body the Church are in blessed unity. We have glimpses in the Apocalypse of the vast assemblies of the saints in heaven about the throne of the Lamb. And the Epistle of the Hebrews gives us a picture of their organized assembly on the heights of the heavenly Zion. It is important for the Church on earth to have a better apprehension of its relations to the Church in the Middle State. The Protestant branch of Christendom is weaker here than the Roman Catholic. It is high time to overcome this defect, for it is not merely agnosticism, it is sin against the mysteries of our religion. The modern Church ought to return to the faith of the ancient Church, and believe in the "Communion of Saints."

XI. Consistency of Christian Doctrine.

We have developed the doctrine of the Middle State in the light of other established Christian doctrines. If the Church has rightly defined these, then it results from them that we must take that view of the Middle State that they suggest. If we are not prepared to do this we cast doubt upon the legitimacy and competency of these doctrines. We confess them inadequate and insufficient. The Calvinistic system, with its principle that salvation is by the divine grace alone, and that this grace is ever prevenient, enables us to believe that the *ordo salutis* begins for all who are saved by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit in this life. This regeneration begets the seeds of a perfect Christian life. For some the *ordo salutis* makes no further advance in this life; for others it advances in different degrees and stages; but for all the redeemed the Middle State is of vast importance as the state in which our redemption is taken up where it is left incomplete in this life and then carried on to its perfection. This view of the Middle State gives it its true theological importance. It enables us to look forward with hope and joy for an entrance upon it. This life is an introduction to it. It mediates between death and the resurrection, and prepares for the ultimate blessedness.

We have thus far considered only the redeemed. Those who do not belong to that company also enter into the Middle State. But their place is a different one. It is represented as a prison, a place of destruction and torment before the resurrection of Christ, in which they are reserved for the day of judgment. There is a silence on the fate of the wicked in the Middle State since the resurrection of Jesus that is profound and unbroken in the New Testament. The presumption is that their condition has not been changed by the resurrection, and that they remain in the prison-house of Hades. There are some who hold that there is a possibility of release from the prison house to join the company of the blessed. Such a hope would, indeed, be a comfort if it could be indulged for all mankind. But there seems to be no solid basis on which to rest it. The grace of God is so grand and glorious in its wonders of redemption that we may rest upon that as the solid rock of comfort. We gain more hope here than we can get from any other source whatsoever. We may be certain that when the final verdict has been rendered, we shall not be surprised that so many were not saved. But we shall rejoice at the wonderful extent and richness of the redemptive love of God in the unexpected multitudes of the blessed. And these will be not chiefly babes and imbeciles, but men and women who have undergone hardships in this life, and have overcome in its trials and temptations.

If we could find evidence in the Scriptures that there was any possibility of the extension of the benefits of regeneration and the efficacy of the means of grace into the abode of the lost, we should be glad to follow it. Or if we could see any evidence from other Christian doctrines that would lead to such a hope we would gladly embrace it. The Scriptures are not so decided against it as many suppose. The one passage with reference to Dives is not decisive for the present dispensation, and therefore does not shut the door of hope. The preaching of Jesus to the spirits in prison is not decisive for the present dispensation, and therefore does not open the door for a larger hope. Jesus by his resurrection made a change in the abode of the dead, by taking some of them at least with him from Hades to Heaven. We do not know what changes have been made in Hades in other respects.

The Arminian doctrine of *Probation* forces all those who believe in it to extend that probation into the Intermediate State. Sooner or later they will do it. But the Calvinistic system is in a very different position. The Calvinistic system solves the difficulties in a much better way. It does not limit the grace of God by human ability or inability. And yet there is nothing in Calvinism itself that prevents the extension of redemption into a future life. In point of fact, Universalism sprang out of an extreme form of Calvinism. The grace of God might work in Hades as well as in this world. Regeneration might take place there as well as here, with or without the use of the means of grace. But we cannot escape the consideration that no one goes to Hades who has not been previously in this world, where the work of regeneration might have been wrought without waiting for the Middle State. If multitudes of infants and imbeciles are regenerated before departing from this life, why not also all others who are to be redeemed ?

Let us heed the Saviour's warning, "Judge not that ye be not judged." We should cease damning our fellow-men and sending them to hell for difference of doctrine, of polity, and of mode of worship. Certainly if it rested with men, not one of us would ever see heaven. If the historic churches were to be the judges, they would empty heaven save of a very few ancient saints, and fill hell with historic Christianity.

If the judgment of the ecclesiastical authorities of the historic churches were ratified in heaven to-day, as they claim that they will be, every Christian now in the world would be excluded from heaven when he dies by the official decision of some one or more of the various ecclesiastic organizations that now govern the Christian world. What a *reductio ad absurdum* is the present opinion of Christendom on this subject !

The Messiah is at hand. There is a day of judgment that is hastening on. We are none of us prepared for it. Let us be thankful that there is a Saviour and a congregation of saints in the Middle State ready to receive us and prepare us for that day, and that when we depart this life in feebleness and imperfection we may be received into the company of the blessed, who will strengthen us and help us to climb the ascents of sanctification and glory.

CHEAP MISSIONARIES AND MISSION EDUCATION.

[*A Reply to the article, "Cheap Missionaries," by Meredith Townsend, reprinted in our November number, pp.* 93–97.]

BY PRINCIPAL MILLER, C.I.E., LL.D.

From *The Contemporary Review*, Oct., 1889.

It is a sign that the missionary movement has attained its majority when it begins to be treated as one of the forces by which the future of mankind must be moulded. Thus Mr. Meredith Townsend's article in the July number of this Review is specially interesting to those who have devoted their lives to the missionary cause. It may seem ungracious for one who welcomes the appearance of such an article, and especially for one who sympathizes with the broad conclusion it arrives at, to say anything against it. Still, it is important that the beginnings of criticism on missions by thoughtful publicists should be based on an accurate acquaintance with facts. There is no publicist in whose fairness I have more confidence than in Mr. Townsend's. But he is as liable as other men to fall into the errors which lurk in generalities. Nor is it astonishing, when account is taken of the rapidity of change in such phases of Indian life as change at all, that important elements should be overlooked by one whose acquaintance with Indian missions has depended for a generation on the unsympathetic utterances of secular newspapers and the small details which alone find place in ordinary Mission Reports. That Mr. Townsend has fallen into mistakes which could hardly be made by one acquainted with Indian missions as they are, it will not be difficult to show.

With the greater part of what he says in the first part of his article, as to the procurability of "cheap missionaries," every man who knows India and is not biassed against missions will substantially agree. Yet even there he betrays the distance of his standpoint and the consequent vagueness of his knowledge. He ascribes much of the existing desire to screw down the income of missionaries to the jealousy with which they are regarded by ministers at home on account of the high place held by them in the esteem of congregations. "The missionaries are their heroes." "Morally the missionary caste is regarded as the Brahmin caste of the clergy—the best, the most tried, the most efficient." It is true that some such feeling existed in Mr. Townsend's boyhood, but it is the purest fancy that it prevails now. Doubtless some relics of it may be found by a careful seeker. In the remoter parts of East Anglia—if "Arcady" has become aware of the existence of missions—and in congregations far up Wensleydale or Swaledale, the missionary is perhaps regarded as a hero still. But those who are well acquainted with any form of church life in England or Scotland (for Protestant Ireland I cannot speak with certainty), know that such ideas have passed away. Setting aside a few like Selwyn, Duff and Livingstone, missionaries have long been regarded by the bulk of ordinary church-goers as men who have gone abroad because they could not get a comfortable settlement at home. I believe there are few congregations in England, and I know there are none in Scotland, at least in any central situation, where an intimation that the services were to be conducted by a missionary, about whom nothing except his being a missionary was known, would not do immensely more to empty the church than to fill it. And about the way in which congregations regard men who wish to settle at home after a few years abroad, it would be easy to tell both pathetic and amusing stories. The contempt for missionaries is probably not so great as it was ten years ago. The pendulum is swinging back. In Scotland, at all events, it has begun to be recognized that missionaries have not all been driven to leave home, and that most of them are fairly on a par with the home pastors who were their class-fellows at college. But to say that they are regarded as superior to home pastors, or to deny that they have long been looked down on, is simply ludicrous to those who are in personal contact with church affairs. The notion of missionaries being overpaid arises directly from their being regarded as inferior articles, which are bad bargains if not got cheaply, infinitely more than in an inverted fashion from their being looked upon as "heroes."

It is another sign of how little Mr. Townsend is in contact with missionary societies, that he does not once look at the question of missionary salaries from the only point of view which churches and societies should take. For the question is not whether missionaries should be willing to endure hardship for the Gospel's sake, but whether Christian men should allow those who do their work for them to endure hardship which they can readily avert. Nobody doubts that it was noble of St. Paul to work on in penury and distress, and to support himself by the labour of his own hands. The only question is whether it would have been noble in the Philippian Church, which sent "once and again unto his necessity," to calculate when it made each remittance what was the smallest sum on which the Apostle could subsist until the next remittance reached him. So, too, in our day: it is admirable, and may sometimes be right, for men to go out as messengers of Christ, regardless of health and comfort, and surrendering for their Master's sake every earthly tie. But men who are called to this will act for themselves if they obey the call. Either they will have nothing to do with missionary societies, or they will use what legitimately comes to them from societies for furthering their work and doing good; as I have little doubt that Paul did with a large proportion of his remittances from Philippi. The question for the society is not what is the missionary's duty, but what is its own. Now its plain duty is to provide its representative with such a portion of "the good things of this life" as, when his upbringing and general surroundings are taken into account, may set him free from pressing cares—let him make use of this provision as he pleases. I cannot conceive of any other answer being given by one who looks at the question of a missionary's allowances from the only point of view that befits the church which sends him. It is a point of view which Mr. Townsend never takes.

But I have no serious quarrel with the earlier part of the article. Mr. Townsend says a few things with which I do not agree, and lays stress on points which I regard as secondary. But, though I might travel by a different route, I should arrive at his conclusion—that by trying to obtain missionaries at the lowest possible figure, the churches will gain nothing "except the privilege of repeating an experiment which has been made half a dozen times and has invariably failed:" to which I should add that they will disgrace themselves and seriously damage their own spiritual life.

The case is different with the part of the article which deals with mission education. Mr. Townsend begins by stating two things: that he has no prejudice against Mission Education, whatever he might have in favour of it; and that he fully comprehends "the arguments which swayed Dr. Duff." As regards the first, few of us are good judges of our peculiar idols of the cane. I know of no journalist more free from intentional unfairness than Mr. Townsend; but old and appreciative readers of the *Spectator*, like myself, will scarcely hear without a smile of its accomplished editor being free from prejudice, if by prejudice be understood the tendency to judge things by an inner light which gives them a good deal of its own complexion. What I regard as Mr. Townsend's chief prejudices will appear as I go on.

As regards the second point, I do not admit that Mr. Townsend comprehends "the arguments which swayed Dr. Duff," and I think it will be admitted by but few of Dr. Duff's surviving friends. But on this question I shall not contend with him. He knew Dr. Duff long before I did, and possibly he knew him better. One thing at least is clear, that he does not comprehend the arguments which sway those who are now doing the work Dr. Duff was the first to set practically on foot. On every page he shows that he has never heard of these arguments, or that he misapprehends them.

But this is not the place for setting forth such arguments. My present aim is simply to state some facts of which the article gives an erroneous impression or takes no account. To begin with—I do not know what Mr. Townsend believes, but certainly his readers will understand him to believe that the great bulk of missionaries in India are what he calls "tutor missionaries." (I fancy the nickname will stick. It marks well the qualified, not excessive, contempt and dislike with which average Anglo-Indians regard the class to which it is applied.) What are the facts, however? I have not the means of ascertaining how all the missionaries in India are employed. But in Southern India, that is, the Madras Presidency and the Native States geographically connected with it, the number of male missionaries from Europe and America has in recent years been between 250 and 300. I have taken much pains to determine the exact number at present labouring among the 50,000,000 and upwards of the South. Including those who are absent on furlough, I believe it to be 297. For two reasons, some trifling inaccuracy is possible. One reason is that some Nonconformist ministers devote a great deal of time to their own countrymen; so that it becomes hard to say whether they should be reckoned as missionaries or as pastors. The other is that some native clergymen have English names. Thus, I have not always been able to make perfectly sure about the birthplace of a certain Rev. Matthew Thomas or William Abraham. It is possible that I have unwittingly placed one or two natives on my list of American and European missionaries. But I believe I am literally exact in stating the number of such missionaries as 297.

I cannot speak so precisely about the number of female missionaries. I do not mean the wives of missionaries, but European or American women supported from home, as distinct mission agents. I have ascertained that there are considerably more than sixty such lady missionaries in Southern India, and probably about eighty. Let them be set down at seventy. This will make the whole missionary strength of Southern India, including all native agents, amount to 367.

Now most missionary bodies have taken something to do with English education.

Experience has led them to see (in some cases very slowly and reluctantly) that schools give them the best, and often the only, opening among the real people of the country—the Hindus as distinct from the non-Hindu elements in the population. But of the 297 male missionaries, only 41 are personally employed in English teaching; and scarcely any of these give their whole time or strength to it. If one were to go into details about fractions of time and strength, it would probably be found that less than thirty men represent the proportion of effective missionary power given to English education. Let that pass, however. Of the lady missionaries, a very few teach a little English to the advanced classes in the schools for native Christian girls. I hardly know whether their doing so brings them within the category of "tutor missionaries;" but even if it does, it will not add more than four or five to the number. The result is that, even when counting as an educationist every one who has anything to do with English education, out of the 367 missionaries of Southern India only 41, or, at the utmost, 45 or 46—in other words, about an eighth—are "tutor missionaries." Now it is generally, and correctly, supposed that the South is the part of India in which mission education is most developed. Thus one-tenth is as near an approximation as I can make to the probable proportion of the entire missionary force which is given to English education. Yet the article seems to proceed on the assumption that maintaining colleges is the only, or at least the main, work of Indian missionaries. Certainly it gives no indication of this being so small a part of what they do. Now many things are useful as a part which would be hurtful if they were the whole. If all missionaries were giving themselves to English teaching, however earnest its character or lofty its tone, I should join in denouncing the system as pernicious and absurd. But when teaching is so subordinate as it is, when it is regarded as auxiliary to other effort—and it is thus that all wise missionaries regard it—the question is entirely changed. That all the men of an army should be employed as scouts or pioneers would be foolish on the face of it. Does it follow that none should be so employed?

This whole question is one on which missionaries are the best, if not the only, judges. The position may conceivably be taken on theoretical grounds that it is wrong to use education as a handmaid to Christianity. But I think that this position will hardly be held by any one—surely least of all by Mr. Townsend. And unless some such view be held, I do not see how there can be any better judges than missionaries themselves of the right extent and method of employing education in any given set of circumstances. Those engaged in doing a thing are likely to know best how to do it, whether the thing in hand be the building of a bridge or the Christianizing of a continent. On the question of education the missionary body in Southern India has spoken with no uncertain sound. Its last opportunity for discussing it was at the Conference held at Bangalore in 1879. There were 117 members of that Conference. Of these, 24 were native clergymen, while seven members came from Ceylon, and four from parts of India which I do not include in the term Southern India. The remaining 82 were a fair representation of the 260 American and European missionaries who, in 1879, were either at work in Southern India or on furlough. As at all such gatherings, the immense majority of the 117 were not engaged in education. It was judged wise, however, to entrust the drawing up of the deliverance of the Conference on this subject to men who could not be supposed to have any personal interest at stake. Here is the resolution *verbatim* which was framed by a committee, no member of which was a "tutor missionary." It was moved and seconded by men who were wholly identified with preaching work. No "tutor missionary" said a word about it. It was adopted by the Conference without modification and without a dissentient voice. It has been reprinted to satiety in missionary publications, but will be new to many readers of this REVIEW.

"RESOLUTION ON THE HIGHER EDUCATION."

"This Conference desires to express its full appreciation of high-class Christian education as a missionary agency, and its hopes that the friends of Indian missions will sympathize with this equally with other branches of Evangelistic work in this country.

"The Native Church in India needs at present, and will still more need in the future, men of superior education to occupy positions of trust and responsibility as pastors, evangelists, and leading members of the community, such as can only be supplied by our high-class Christian institutions.

"Those missionaries who are engaged in *vernacular work* desire specially to bear testimony to the powerful effect in favour of Christianity which these institutions are exercising throughout the country, and to record their high regard for the *educational work* as a necessary part of the work of the Christian Church in India.

"This Conference feels bound to place on record its conviction that these two great branches of Christian work are indispensable complements of one another, and would earnestly hope that they will be so regarded by the Christian Church, and that both will meet with continued and hearty support."

If it were a deliverance of military men on a military point, or of doctors on some difficulty in practical sanitation, it would be accepted as settling the question. And if there were any large survival of the feeling of missionaries being "the best, the most tried, the most efficient" of the clerical order, I think it would be accepted as decisive, even on a missionary point.

Of course this deliverance left open, and was meant to leave open, all questions of detail. I have no dispute with those who hold that the proportion of mission strength spent on education should be a little less or a little greater than it is. Such points are always open to discussion. Opinions on them will vary, and ought to vary, according to varying circumstances. But the article before me means, if it means anything, that "tutor missionaries" were a mistake from the beginning, and ought to be utterly abolished. On that broad general question I must be excused if I prefer the judgment of those who are side by side with the educationists and know their work, to that of one who has had no experience of South India as it is on which to base his views.

But it is not missionary opinion alone that this portion of the article sets at nought. It contains a number of dark sayings which seem directly opposed to facts, or such an imperfect statement of facts as to be virtually opposed to them. I shall take one or two as specimens.

Education, we are told, "does not even improve India." "Nobody in India believes educated Indians to be better than old Indians of the same temperaments." I do not know whether this may have been true in Bengal thirty years ago, but certainly it is not true of the India I see around me today. Education has had disagreeable, and perhaps in a few points even bad, effects; but that it has vastly improved India on the whole, I did not know till I read this article that there was a sensible man alive who doubted. It would be vastly nearer the truth to say, "Everybody in India believes educated Indians to be better than old Indians." Let the opinion of men like Sir C. U. Aitchison or Sir W. W. Hunter, who are now in Britain, be asked on this point. In India itself I do not believe that a single administrative officer, old enough to compare things as they are with what they were before education had become so general, will hesitate to testify to the improvement that has taken place. From such men it is the merest commonplace to hear that the general standard of purity and honour—the standard, for example, of the public service—though lower than it should be, is immensely higher than it was a quarter of a century ago. And it will be found that the standard is highest where mission education has been strongest, and lowest where education has been hardly in the hands of missionaries at all—as, for instance, in the country districts around Bombay.

These, it may be said, are but vague impressions. Let me give a single definite proof of what is believed in India. Seven years ago, a Commission was appointed to examine into Indian education. It consisted of twenty-one members, of whom not by any means all were educationists. Five were civil servants who were employed, or had been employed, as district officers. Seven were native gentlemen, Hindu or Mohammedan. Only three were missionaries, and one of the three was not an educational missionary. The Commission examined many witnesses in every province, and gave particular attention to the moral and social effects of English education. They did not conceal the darker side of things; but, in innumerable passages of their voluminous Report, they show clearly that, in their opinion, education had proved highly beneficial on the whole. A single extract may be given—not by any means the strongest, but perhaps the most carefully balanced that is short enough to quote:—

> "The reformers of 1885, to whom the system is due, claimed that only by an education in English, and after European methods, could we hope to raise the moral and intellectual tone of Indian society, and supply the Administration with a competent body of public servants. To what degree, then, have these objects been attained? Our answer is in the testimony of witnesses before this Commission, in the thoughtful opinions delivered from time to time, by men whose positions have given them ample opportunities of judging, and in the facts obvious to all eyes throughout the country. And that answer is conclusive: if not that collegiate education has fulfilled all the expectations entertained of it, at least that it has not disappointed the hopes of a sober judgment."

That these twenty-one gentlemen, representing every shade of opinion and every class of the community, believed "educated Indians to be better than old Indians," is undeniable. Some of their utterances have been called in question; but I am not aware that what they said on this point has ever until now been challenged. Perhaps they would not all agree with me, but to my mind it is certain that the influence of Christian education, pervading in some degree the whole educated community, has been the chief cause of that moral growth the existence of which they unanimously affirmed.

"Of the absence of altruism there is proof in the slight agitations raised for the reform of the more oppressive native customs." That these agitations are less effective than might be wished, will be conceded; but that they exist at all, and still more that they are steadily growing and penetrating the mass of Hindu society more deeply—are these not proofs of the beneficent effects of education and, as I at least believe, mainly of Christian education?

But even though there be improvement in morality, we have to face the dictum about Christian education that "as a method of evangelizing India it has failed, and always must fail." That comparatively few of those educated have joined the Christian Church I admit; and that few will join it very soon I am not prepared to deny. But in full view of this admission, and without perceiving any inconsistency in doing so, I hold that "the system" has succeeded, and that there is every sign of its being more and more successful. In saying so, I expect to be supported by every one who knows the facts and who judges by the only standards applicable in a discussion of the kind. For the success of any instrumentality must be judged by the nature of the work it is fitted to perform. Who would judge of the efficiency of a plough by the number of sheaves it could deliver, or of a reaping machine by the number of acres it could dig up? The wise farmer uses each of his implements in the appropriate way and expects his harvests from the united effects of all. Education is not fitted to bring men of immature minds, whose characters are only in process of being formed, into the organized Christian Church upon any extensive scale. At most, it may be expected to bring one here and another there to the point of breaking all human ties in obedience to a divine call. This it has done and is doing. But it is fitted to plant thoughts and awaken impulses which may make the work of the missionary, in the strict sense, tell more powerfully. It is fitted to make the soil good, and thus to contribute much towards securing, at the proper time, an abundant harvest. This also it has done and is doing.

Granted that the harvest is not yet so plentiful as the missionary and his society desire. It is possible to say much to account for that. The scale on which the process needs to be gone through in India is enormous; and the harvest has been delayed by the extent to which most missionaries have given their attention, not to the central mass of the population, but to the outlying sections which have been not at all, or very imperfectly, Hinduized. I do not mean to find fault with them for having done so. Still, the fact goes far to explain why Christian education has had a smaller visible outcome than was at one time expected from it.

But I conceive that those who believe in the government of God and in their own chief end being to carry out His purposes, have not very much to do with questions about rates of progress. For such, the great question is whether they are following the right road. The time of reaching their journey's end is a matter of subordinate importance. But then Mr. Townsend says that Christian education has not "given to the class affected any general bias towards" Christianity. This depends upon the sense in which the words are used. That educated Hindus have not much of a bias towards the open profession of Christianity is true. For some years, the general bias has been in a contrary direction. But if to have a growing apprehension of the majesty and power of what Christians have learnt from their divine Master be included in what is meant by a bias towards Christianity, then such a bias is plainly to be discerned. Some months ago, when the papers were full of Mr. Caine's attacks, a Hindu friend, many hundred miles from Madras, wrote to ask me whether there was any danger that missions would be induced to give up education. He deprecated their doing so in the strongest terms, and wondered what people could consider to be success if it was not success to have made, as he phrased it, "the spirit of Christ to prevail in India." I should not employ his phrase myself. It is but a dim adumbration of the spirit of Christ that prevails in India as yet. But that first faint streak is the certain herald of the dawn, and will be followed by the glories of the perfect day.

The fact is simply this. The educated men, or a large proportion of the educated men, in Southern India have come to set before them as the true model of life a not altogether distorted pattern of practical Christianity. They estimate rightly the moral fruits which Christianity produces, or tends to produce, in Christians. But as yet they have not generally learned that a living Christianity is the only tree on which such fruits can grow. At present they are for the most part struggling hard to believe that Hinduism, in some amended form, will produce all the fruits which they have learnt to value. They are trying to read as much as possible of the truths and the spirit of Christianity into Hinduism. Of course the attempt is foredoomed to disappointment. But it is an attempt which it is natural for Hindus to make at the commencement of their religious awakening. It is an attempt which is a proof of their sincerity; and it seems to be a necessary part of the divine training that they should discover its futility *for themselves.* Thus, setting mere excrescences aside, the present state of feeling is at bottom a proof that the process of transition through which India must pass is going on healthily. To one who seeks mainly the enlargement and triumph of his particular church, the situation is certainly unsatisfactory. But to one who regards churches and societies as means towards spiritual ends, to one who puts the lasting good of India foremost in his thoughts and who cares chiefly about being the means of working out some part of the divine plan, it is full of encouragement and hope. It is a situation which many things have helped to bring about; but the chief of them has been the influence of missions, and of educational far more than of any other missions.

Of course to have awakened the leading element in the vast Indian community to a new ideal of life—to have set them to ask how this ideal can be attained, and in the first place to try to attain it by readjustments of their ancestral system—all this is a trivial thing, if one judges by the standard of numbers, or by the applause which visible success elicits from the Church and from the world. One would not expect, however, to find Mr. Meredith Townsend among those who reckon by these standards. Nor would he be found among them if he were in contact with the facts. Seeing from a distance, he sees nothing in young India but a generation "intoxicated with the sense of freedom" and which has lost "all originality." If he were seeing with his own eyes, he would see that while his charges contain a large amount of superficial truth, there are also many things at work which are signs and germs of deep moral and spiritual change. It is true that the change will not be completed soon, and that thirty years have not done much more than begin it. But lasting developments have tedious beginnings; and those whom God employs to effect them must exercise something of His own divine patience. They must learn to wait. But they can afford to wait.

But how is it that a sympathetic observer like Mr. Townsend has failed, even at a distance, to discern these joyful signs? One reason is that in the province which he formerly knew, such signs are fewer and more faint than elsewhere. The divorce between knowledge and real thought, the inclination to value education merely as a means of getting on in life, the general shallowness and "bumptiousness," of which there is too much everywhere, are greater than anywhere else in Bengal. There, the germs of good are at their minimum and the disagreeable effects of education at their maximum. Other causes of the position taken up by Mr. Townsend might be given if I had space. One, however, is too important to be passed over. It is the attitude of the Anglo-Indian press and Anglo-Indian society. Whatever be the cause, it is well known that the tone of "society" in India is opposed to moral, and still more to definitely religious, work among the "natives." It is "bad form" to take a personal interest in the people of the country. Of course there are many exceptions. There are Civil servants, and military men, and lawyers, and merchants who have as genuine interest in the people as any missionary. But, however numerous, these are exceptions. The missionaries are the only Europeans who, as a class, are in living contact with the people, and who show clearly that it is on the people that their thoughts habitually turn. And of all missionaries the educational missionary most conspicuously violates the canon of aloofness from natives which "society" lays down. Most missionaries are in quiet rural stations; and even if fully in the public eye, are not so much identified with the class of natives with which ordinary Europeans come in contact. But the educational missionary is naturally located in some social centre and has to do with that pushing, restless, uncomfortable class—the "educated natives"—which "society" regards with a strange mixture of dislike, contempt, and apprehension. And the educational missionary has not only to do with this class, but treats them as men of like passions with himself. He is the personal friend of some of them; he argues with them on common ground, submits his judgment occasionally to theirs, laughs with them or laughs at them, "chaffs" them, loses his temper with them perhaps too often, but shows in his whole bearing towards them that he regards them as individuals with characters of their own, not as a mere class, to be trampled on or patronized as the case may be, but anyhow to be kept at arm's length. Thus "society" has a more pronounced quarrel with the educational than with any other missionary; and the press, which is the echo of "society," gives open expression to the quarrel with him. The newspapers pass over his successes or minimize them, and make all that can be made of his failures and mistakes. They magnify every trouble that his opponents succeed in raising into a total collapse of his plans. They deride him if he comes short of the most complete ideal, or fails to fulfil the most high-wrought expectations. They open their columns to every one who wishes to have a fling at him. There are honourable exceptions; but that this is the general tone of the Anglo-Indian press it is not possible to deny. Then the parable is taken up at home. The prevailing idea there being that missionaries are poor creatures, credit is given to all that is charged against them. And since educational mission work is that of which the Indian press says most, and that which in its very nature is slowest and least openly successful, it bears the main brunt of hostile criticism. Thus the idea is propagated that the work of Christian colleges and schools is all failure, at the very time when, along their own line, some of them are eminently successful. For it must be borne in mind that scarcely in a single instance do attacks on their work come from those who have an intimate acquaintance with it. They come from men in Britain who know nothing of the state of India. They come, though very seldom, from Christian men who have been long in India, but whose early prejudices against mission education have kept them from examining for themselves the thing they criticise. They come, a little more frequently, from earnest men who have been a year or two in the East, and who judge by what, as they imagine, things ought to be. Seldom, if ever, do they come from men who, whatever line of work they most sympathize with, have a wide experience of the moral and spiritual wants of the country. On page 133 of the Report of the Allahabad Conference in 1872, may be read how perhaps the most devoted itinerant or preaching missionary that the Church of England ever had in Bengal, spoke on the subject of Christian education :—

> 'With respect," he said, "to the remarks of the young brother with the black beard, whose name I did not catch, I may state that, when I had been in the country as short a time as he has been, my impressions upon this subject were precisely what his appear to be. I was most strongly opposed to missionary schools and colleges; I looked upon that department of missionary labour as a great mistake. But although not a Scotchman, I am, I think, constitutionally a little cautious. Accordingly I determined not to say a word or write a line about what I thought or felt, I resolved to wait and watch, and feel my way to an unbiassed conclusion; and now after more than seventeen years' close and careful observation, I have arrived at the deliberate conviction that my first impressions were *wrong*: that school work is a most valuable and important part of missionary agency, an agency that is largely contributing to the future glorious triumph of the Redeemer's cause in this land. I do not feel that I could myself engage in educational work; I am not fitted for it; but nevertheless I feel the highest regard for those dear brethren who are engaged in this work, and I do *not* think it to be, as some one here has described it, an easy work. It is in my estimation one of the hardest and most trying parts of missionary labour. We preaching missionaries have an actual enjoyment and even exhilaration often attending us in our work, to which the plodding school missionary is altogether a stranger. He is doing hard, heavy, and important work without any present reward. I honour him for it, and believe that he is doing God's work as really and truly as are preaching missionaries."

The prophecy implied in this was fulfilled. At the Conference of 1882, in Calcutta, I met the brother "with the black beard"—which was not then so black as ten years before—and found that he had become a thorough-going supporter of mission education. But the attacks that proceed from all the above classes taken together are much fewer than those that come from men who are opponents of all missions, or hopelessly ignorant of everything connected with them. In Southern India nearly every such attack is *anonymous*. It is so for the sufficient reason that if the writer's name were known, there would be considerable amusement at the idea of his posing as a critic of missions, or pretending to deplore their failure.

Take the Mission College in which I am employed. It is seldom that a long period elapses without articles or letters—sometimes whole volleys of them—decrying its character, misrepresenting its aims, glorying over, or professedly lamenting its failure. But many years have passed—more than a dozen, I believe—since any such newspaper attack was signed. Meantime, I do not know of one man, or at most of only one, in sympathy with other mission work, who can be justly regarded as an opponent of the college. There may be others, but I have never heard of them. Of course the college has its critics among men who sympathize with missions. Some think that it is too wide, and some too narrow; some that it attempts too much, and some that it attempts too little. Many perhaps are of opinion that it is not conducted so well as they would conduct it. But no institution that has a widespread and powerful influence should expect, or even wish, to be exempt from criticism of this kind. And of course the college is not all that might be desired, or that it may yet become. The important question is whether, with all its real or supposed defects, it is not a powerful means of promoting the kingdom of heaven in Southern India. If even a single man who is known to value Christian work, and who is at all acquainted with the college and its influence, will say that it is not this, and say it *over his own name*, I shall begin to ask whether I have not misapplied the labour of half a lifetime—a question which for long years I have not felt any need to ask.

In speaking as I do, I may at all events be credited with sincerity. In any selfish point of view, it makes no difference to me if the salaries of missionaries be reduced to those of "Portuguese clerks" to-morrow. I have had openings enough elsewhere, and could enjoy life without taking advantage of any of them. I remain where I am because I know—let all the journalists of India deny it if they please—that I am promoting a very humble, yet an indispensable, part of what the purposes of God require to be done. Of course sincerity goes for little if a man be a fanatic or a fool. But even among the anonymous assailants whom the appearance of this reply will probably evoke in considerable number, I am confident that not one will describe me as a fanatic, and that only a few will write me down a fool.

Mr. Townsend concludes his article with a description of what, in his opinion, Indian missionaries ought to be. I am glad to be able to close my reply in complete agreement with him. There is room and urgent need that a small proportion should be employed in planting thoughts and stirring aspirations which Christ alone can satisfy, in moulding character so that it shall respond to the life and immortality which the Gospel has brought to light, in making the whole environment of the young Indian Church as favourable as possible to its speedy and healthy growth. Some, too, will continue, and should continue, to devote themselves to literary and industrial pursuits; and a few are needed to fill the post of Secretary or General Manager in the larger organizations But the great bulk of Indian missionaries ought to be what Mr. Townsend calls "preaching bishops." There is no need to quarrel about the title he employs. Their noblest function is to organize, to stimulate and guide the efforts of as many native evangelists as they can.

But the extraordinary thing is how Mr. Townsend should be ignorant that what he describes as "preaching bishops" is exactly what the bulk of Indian missionaries are. Except the few whom Providence has led along different lines, this is what they all aim at being. It is true there are not yet "a hundred" native workers for each of them to direct. And it is right, until time and strength are wholly taken up by such directing, that they should do, as best they can, something of the work of evangelists themselves. It is by doing it, even though with many drawbacks and failures, that they will learn how to direct those others whose birth and training will enable them, in the long run, to do it better. But what Mr. Townsend desiderates is what the vast preponderance of Indian missionaries wish to be, and what to a considerable extent most of them are. The fact that they largely are already what he maintains they should be, is the only thing that gives any plausibility to the absurd charges of luxury and self-indulgence which have been hurled against them.

Thus I can part from Mr. Townsend with gratitude for that appreciation of the right principles of missionary labour which underlies his mistaken antagonism to the particular form of work with which I am chiefly connected. I should be confident of his perfect sympathy with my own work if he knew better what the facts of missionary experience actually are, at all events in Southern India.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

BY REV. JULIUS HAPPEL, HEUBACH, SOUTH GERMANY.

(Condensed Translation from the *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, IV. Jahrgang [1889] Heft. 3, by Rev. Charles C. Starbuck, Andover, Mass.)

I. Are funeral rites connected with the religious faith of the peoples ?

Almost universally, not merely from the indifferent, but from those attached to the Church, we hear it said that burial rites are no matter of faith ; even very orthodox Christians are for cremation, etc. Is this true ? Has the mode of disposing of the dead nothing to do with the Christian faith ?

If it is improbable in itself that funeral rites have nothing to do with Christian, and indeed ecclesiastical life, still less probable is such a severance when we look abroad into the immeasurable sea of the religious life of general mankind, and on this basis examine the special question of Christian national life.

Such a look abroad shows it as a fact beyond question that the mode of burial is most intimately connected with the religious faith of the peoples, and that it is this very fact which explains the index differences in the mode of sepulture.

The deep influence of the peculiar religious faith, even among the wildest races, is shown strikingly by the fact, attested by Peschel ("Völkerkunde"), that, in the New Hebrides, and formerly on the Fiji Islands, when one was buried alive it was at his own request, that he might find himself in the other world in full strength and not exhausted by age. This mitigates our judgment of the scenes of horror described by Williams, when at the funeral of a Fiji chief his wives were strangled. On the Loyalty Islands, if a beloved child was buried, the mother or an aunt was killed, to have the care of it. Not widely unlike were the usages of those Eastern peoples described by Herodotus, who, to save their parents the irksomeness of old age, put them to death and reverently consumed their flesh. When Darius I. asked some Greeks at what price they would devour the flesh of their deceased parents, they answered, At no price. When he asked certain Indians at what price they would burn them, they cried out against the impiety. What the Greeks abhorred was to them the deepest sign of affectionate fellowship.

On the other hand, Buddhism, despising the body, often praises its committal to the wild beasts. Buddha's self-sacrifice to the starving tiger-cubs is almost the heart of Buddhist tradition. In like manner, Greek philosophers asked how they wished their bodies to be disposed of, answered: "As you will."

Even so, Stoic Pantheism, viewing the dead body from which the allsoul, temporarily individualized by it, has departed, as mere excrement, teaches its disciples to be utterly indifferent as to what becomes of it.

To have carried the idealistic view of the world to its height seems to have been the merit of the Indian philosophy. Therefore the Hindus burned the body, that Agni, the pure god of fire, consuming its grosser elements, might invest the departed with a refined vehicle of existence, suitable to his higher and more spiritual mode of existence. Therefore the Rig-Veda says: "This earthly fire is the one thing, next thou shalt find the second, unite thyself with the third."

In most significant contrast with this dematerialization of the world, impelling religious faith to cremation as its most expressive figure of immortality, stands burial in the earth, which has established itself everywhere that men believe in a resurrection, regeneration, and renewal of the world. This thought was expressed by the yearly return of death and life in the changing seasons. The earth, therefore, is the all-receiving and all-renewing mother of all living germs and beings. "When I was curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth," says the Psalmist. The Parsees suppose a lake, in which all germs are thus guarded. The Druids and the Eleusinian mystagogues, teaching that death is a renewal, by the power of Mother Earth—Demeter—into a higher form of life, required the Demetrioi, the Initiated, to be not burned, but buried, shooting forth as germs of immortality.

Earth burial, therefore, as Quenstädt admirably demonstrates, was in antiquity regarded as the original, because most natural form of sepulture. Therefore tradition makes out the earliest patriarchs, biblical or legendary—Cecrops, Numa, Moses, Abraham, and Adam—to have been buried. And so the Christian Church, as the Fathers bear witness, has returned to the most original and most natural use.

Gregory Nazianzen beautifully names men "twice buried," because they first lie in the womb covered and, as it were, buried, before they are born into life, until they shall again be awakened into life eternal. Heraclitus, teaching that all things come from fire, insists that the body shall be dissolved by fire. But Quenstädt, remarking that God's Spirit has taught us more justly that our body was framed of earth, shows that by Heraclitus' own rule it ought to be committed to the earth.

The realistic Chinese are the strictest in their adherence to earth burial. Viewing the earth as the territory of the dead, they are unwilling to have it disturbed by the laying out of railroads, etc.

Yet, on the other hand, earth and fire might appear too holy to admit of the committal of corpses to them. Therefore the Zoroastrians of old, as Persians and now as Parsees, permitted neither mode of sepulture. Formerly they exposed the dead on mountain-tops or towers, to be devoured by dogs kept for the purpose, and called eutaphists, buriers. Now they expose them on high scaffoldings to decay or to be devoured by vultures, lest the holy elements, the work of the good God, Ahuramazda, should be defiled by their corruption, which is by Zoroastrianism regarded as a work of the evil spirit.

And so, among ninety-nine one hundredths of the human race it can easily be proved that the mode of sepulture coheres with the religious faith. The remaining one one hundredth therefore admits of an easy induction to the same effect.

From the examples already given, which have been chosen especially for their significance, and which could easily be multiplied, we see how intimately the religious faith of the peoples coheres with the sepulture of the dead. Two points especially appear to stand out firm and clear: The mode of sepulture is determined: (1) by the religious faith in general; (2) by the peculiar form of the belief in Immortality in particular. But most widely, deeply, and completely is it determined by the peculiar principle of religious morality in the national life, as must now be shown.

Among the so-called nature-races (*Naturvölker*), whose life is still imprisoned in sense, who view the future existence as merely a continuance of the present, after its interruption by death, to be spent under the earth, in heaven, in the air, etc., there is generally the largest allowance as to the form of sepulture, it being indifferent whether one arrives at his appointed place through fire, earth, air, or some other element, while a reference to beauty, seemliness, human dignity, and especially to deeper religiousness or purer morality is as yet entirely out of the field of view. Things are quite different on the standing-point of the more refined development and cultivation of the feelings and sensibility. Here there are fewer and fewer indifferent forms of human action. Every action has now its definite stamp, religious and ethical, internally and externally; it must be accommodated to the moral principle, the moral norm, by which all actions on this stage of religion and culture are pervaded.

People who imagine that the question of sepulture has nothing to do with the religious belief of Christians ought to be examined as to whether they hold the funeral usages of Buddhism or Parsism to be permissible for Christians. I cannot see what exception could be taken from their point of view to keeping animals on corpses; of course only as an option—*e.g.*, if any one would like after his death to be devoured by his own hound.

It was a school-boy argument, not to say one implying naïve ignorance, when lately, in a discussion of the question in a German legislature, it was represented that the Greeks were a refined and highly cultivated people, and yet that they found in cremation nothing unæsthetic or opposed to religious and ethical feeling. Plato and Aristotle have also given their approbation to slavery, polygamy, nay, even to unnatural love; shall we Christians therefore reintroduce these also? And, again, would it have beseemed the Greeks and Romans and other cultivated peoples of the ancient world to have dealt with their dead like the rudest barbarians? Or would it be suitable for us Christians to define our conduct by the principle which defined the religion and morality of even the highest peoples of culture in the ancient world?

Upon the naturalistic position of the heathen peoples, on which man was not regarded as anything specifically distinguished from the brute, where man too claims no other place than that of a product of nature, and was not honored as an ethical personality created in the image of God, where the slave and woman might yet be handled as a thing, a commodity, there either burning or interment might be regarded as of equal value as a return to Mother Nature. At a time when (as can be proved even of the Greeks and Romans of the classical era) men yet held it lawful to bring human sacrifices and bury them alive to propitiate the subterranean gods, or to burn them, then, doubtless, cremation or interment might as yet be equally significant, and a wide variation in the treatment of the dead equally admissible.

This state of things necessarily changed at one stroke by the words: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness!" Man is not a product of Nature like other creatures, but *personally* created by God. Through this *personal* creation of man by God, man became, in soul and body, something specifically distinct from the mere animal.

And here Christianity has interposed, inasmuch as it will have the human body held and honored as the temple of the living God. Not only the members of the soul, but those of the body are to be instruments of the Holy Ghost. Here the body also is no more the man's own, to do as he will with it, but Christ's own, who shall transform the body of our humiliation (therefore not as by fire) that it may be fashioned like unto his glorified body (Phil. iii. 21).

On this new and higher Christian level of apprehension of God and the world, therefore, the sepulture of the dead must also become new in form and substance.

I. For, as the result of our argumentation, we have seen that *The Sepulture of the Dead is so intimately conjoined with the religious belief of the Peoples,* that the more spiritual, religiously deep, and morally pure the belief in immortality becomes, so much the more spiritual, religiously deep, and morally pure—in a word, the more ethical, must also the form of sepulture become.

It is consequently, II., the question, *Which is the Form of Sepulture required by the moral principle of the Christian religion?* Or, is the ecclesiastical usage of interment, hitherto practised, the form of sepulture which alone answers to the specific Christian principle?

Let us first specify this form more nearly. Not interment simply, nay, not merely interment (for the body is sometimes given to the deep), is the Christian mode of sepulture. For interment occurs also in forms of sepulture wholly inadmissible to Christians. But such an interment as most appropriately expresses the Christian belief touching death and resurrection; the most reverent treatment, envelopment and interment of the human body, as representing the sown seed, out of which the new, glorified, and yet identical body is to proceed.

In the parable of the corn of wheat,

> "Which living dies,
> "And dying lives,
> "Slumbers and wakes again,
> "Falls into earth, and rises up therefrom,"

is transfigured, renewed, and brings much fruit, the deepest mystery of the Christian life, its most central process, the mystery of regeneration, of resurrection, is set forth. As we die in and with Christ, so are we also buried in him and with him, so also do we rise again in, with and through him.

Even our baptism signifies a burial, a being buried with Christ by baptism into death and by a living burial. But we Christians bury a living seed, no rigid mummy, no dead ashes, but a seed of God, a plant of God, which is planted in God's field. "For as we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

"Therefore," says Andreæ (295, 296), "the early Christians named the day of death Natalitia, and they commonly wrapped a corpse in fine white linen, as if renewing the day of baptism."

Resurrection is not a mechanical process of combustion and annihilation, but an *organic* process of life, therefore are we sown. The seed is hidden in the earth, as in the warm maternal bosom, for all living things. Here it sinks back into an embryonic condition, sleeping like a child in the womb, for a joyous waking and blossoming. And if any one says, How? the apostle's answer is: Thoughtless one! what is sown must die to live.

For this very reason it is precisely the process of corruption which is so striking a figure of the Christian idea of dying and rising again, because corruption (but not burning) represents the special sentence of death passed against the old, outward, earthly man. The old, outward, earthly man, made out of the earth, is the husk of the new, interior, heavenly man, of heavenly descent. The former, as the husk of the seed, is made of earth, therefore weak, futile, perishable, resolved again to earth. But the seed of God hidden under this husk, the real (incorporate) divine image, in distinction from the ideal, formal divine image, prefigured in the first, in the elementary man, shall be released from death's fetter, from the weight of the grave. Thus, there is a sowing in corruption and a rising again in power. There is sown a natural body, there rises again a spiritual body.

Christianity teaches a duplex death; the former comes to pass through *corruption* (becoming earth); and to this all natural and sinful men are subject (exception: the saints shall not see corruption); the second comes to pass through FIRE; it is at the end of the world; it is a death of annihilation, when death annihilates all perishable being and also itself.

The process of corruption, therefore, also represents a sentence of death, indeed, even a sentence of eternal death; but the latter only for those who bear about them nothing but what is corruptible; while for those transplanted into the heavenly range of life there is a dying and sinking to earth by necessity of nature, that so the new man can rise again out of this. Corruption (mouldering away) is also a process of combustion, only a slow one, and therefore a process of life.

If the natural, earthly, material kernel can pass through the process of corruption, without harm to the living germ, enclosed in the husk, the germ of pneumatic life, the seed of God, which the regenerate man bears in himself, then first shows its capacity of outlasting not only the first, but also the second death.

Had the man who is laid in the grave been during his life nothing more than chaff, this, it is true, would be most vividly expressed by combustion.

Cremation (I do not say Fire) is for us Christians the symbol of Hell. The chaff shall be burned up with unquenchable fire.

On this ground, in the Christian Church, heretics were burned.

Not the blessed, who die in the Lord, but the absolutely reprobate, or (according to 1 Cor. iii. 15) the not yet converted must pass through the fire, and, like Dives, suffer torment in the flame.

We do not here overlook the fact that fire in and of itself by no means symbolizes merely a process of annihilation, but also one of purification and glorification, an ennobling process, as we, indeed, have already seen to have been true of the Hindus and Germans. But it was so to them, as it cannot be to us, because they, as seen especially in Buddhism, accounted the palpable human body as something evil, to be put away, while Christianity accounts it as something good, appertaining to the true, abiding, eternal human nature. The flesh and blood of man is the basis of his individuality: therefore the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. Therein is the concrete image of God, in its individual manifestation, expressed.

The human body, even the material, is, according to Christian apprehensions, no mere slag, which is parted from the soul by fire, like dross from gold, but is itself a piece, part, member of human nature, as being in the image of God, which, taken together with the soul, then only constitutes the whole man, and is therefore not to be resolved into the elements, but is to be reanimated and glorified. That which is to be separated from man and annihilated, that from which his body and soul are to be purified, is not the earthly and palpable matter, but evil, which is purged off by spiritual fire (of affliction), through burning while yet alive, this genuinely Christian self-cremation, through the chemical process of conversion and sanctification. Therefore a self-cremation—*i.e.*, a voluntarily chosen fiery death as a martyr for the Christian faith, would correspond very well to the constitutive moral principle of the Christian religion; and so far the Hindu suttee, as also an analogous use of the old Germans, is a manner of death and sepulture far more nearly approximate to the Christian idea, than the mere disposal of the corpse by means of a furnace, which brings vividly to mind a statue of Moloch or a chemical laboratory, or indeed a mere druggist's still.

III. Conclusion. The Eternal, Spiritual Essence of Christianity and the Mode of Sepulture.

In this question also the weightiest fact, which at the same time constitutes the specific and distinguishing glory of Christianity above all other religions, is the independence of Christianity (and therefore of the Christian faith in the Resurrection, but not of Christians), as the religion of the Spirit, from everything visible and transitory, therefore also from any particular form of sepulture. This spiritual nature of Christianity is already set forth in the Johannean writings with unsurpassable clearness. The words: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. . . . My words are spirit and life. He that was from the beginning, the Life. . . . I am the Resurrection and the Life . . ." are written from an elevation to which things terrestrial and transitory do not attain.

But although Christianity is independent of the mode of sepulture, Christians are not. Our conscience, enlightened by God's word and sharpened by the Holy Spirit, must teach us to prove and distinguish what is of the world and what of God, that we may, over against wavering opinions and the shifting ideas of various ages, correctly maintain the eternal principle of Christianity, without violating Christian love and truth.

Now, the biblical passages cited above, where we were speaking of Interment as the most exact symbolical expression of Christian faith in the Resurrection, show most distinctly in what a deep-reaching connection the peculiar belief as to Immortality, not only of the Old Testament but also of the New, stands with burial in the earth, and that interment is not only to be held fast as that which most strikingly symbolizes the Christian faith in the Resurrection, but also because (likewise according to the early Christian view) the preliminary home of the dead appears to be, not in heaven, but in the earth.

For there is much matter of thought in the passage (Matt. xii. 40) according to which the Son of man was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; and out of "the *dead*," not "out of death" (as is commonly said), did the Lord rise. Shall we therefore, after our earthly decease, also be in the heart of the earth, among the dead, in Hades, in the realm of the dead?

In view of the obscurity, and yet urgency of the great enigma and its anxieties, which unites the biblico-ecclesiastical faith in the Resurrection with its "already in heaven," and yet also "rise again at the last day," it is so much more to be counselled that we should not arbitrarily abandon the traditional mode of sepulture, and set in its place a form of sepulture belonging to an altogether different circle of ideas.

Cremation has its true place on the soil of Buddhism, with its denial of the real world; but is inorganic, heterogeneous on the soil of Hebraism and Christianity, with their affirmation of the real world.

All national usage (*Sitte*) is an organic growth out of the collective, natural, and spiritual life of a people or a community of peoples, and this the more certainly the longer and more universally prevalent it is.

This applies very especially to the usage of interment, which originated so long ago in the midst of the life of the Christian peoples, has become universal, and has been transmitted through so many ages. It cannot possibly be inorganic—*i.e.*, spring out of a mere unreflecting habit, a caprice of mode. And even if it were an hereditary disease, even a disease is not to be healed in a purely mechanical way, by a mere removal of the infectious matter, but only organically—*i.e.*, by the substitution of better conditions of health.

Here, if anywhere, belongs the pregnant utterance: "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." If cremation (especially in the modern form) were actually a more perfect mode of sepulture—*i.e.*, one more exactly setting forth the idea of the Christian faith in the Resurrection, then we would without hesitation pass over to it. But it is a barbarism, by which we not only sink below the Greeks and Romans, but sink among the rudest peoples, the children of mere nature.

Even among the most savage peoples it is still a *higher idea* which has been controlling in determining how the dead should be disposed of; all other grounds of utility or injuriousness had to yield to that; and is this no longer to be the case among us Christians of the nineteenth century? Can it be that we have become so rude that we set reasons of simple temporal utility above the higher idea—that is, the Kingdom of God?

When the Greeks, Romans, Germans burned the corpses of persons of rank, they did this for the sake of the higher idea—*i.e.*, to distinguish them thereby; and from their point of view—*i.e.*, their peculiar beliefs as to immortality, this was in fact a distinction. But we Christians stand no longer on the platform of the Greeks and Romans, we no longer make a distinction between gods and demigods, men and half men; and have also a higher conception of immortality, of which they as yet knew nothing.

When Jacob Grimm says that we cannot bring back the now antiquated use, this is as much as to say we cannot bring back the idea which lay at the basis of cremation. It is not cremation, as such, as an external usage that is heathenish, but the religious belief therein incorporated. To this we cannot give renewed life.

The following propositions in conclusion:

(1) Interment is a primitive Christian use, which ought not to be impugned without necessity, and should only be handled with the greatest and most forbearing caution, although it may well be developed and perfected.

(2) It is interwoven with the whole circle of Christian thought and feeling, as shown in popular poetry, spiritual and secular, church ordinances, legislation, etc.

(3) It is evidently the most striking symbolization of the specifically Christian faith of the Resurrection, and touches upon the deepest mystery of the Christian faith.

(4) The constitutive moral principle of Christianity requires fulfilment, not abrogation; perfecting, not destroying; elevation and ennobling, not debasement and searing of religious and ethical feeling. Now, Cremation, which is proposed instead of the ancestral Interment of the Church, implies the searing of the religious and ethical feeling, and a submersion of it into a lower morass of barbarism than is found among the most barbarous of savages.

BROTHERHOODS OF THE POOR.

BY VEN. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER.

From *Murray's Magazine*, London, October, 1889.

We have recently witnessed a strike which must be regarded as one of the most remarkable in modern times. It began among the lowest, most despised, and most down-trodden class of unskilled labourers—a class which has been proverbial for misery and poverty, and for the struggle of many to secure the scantily-paid toil which can only be allotted to the few. Beginning among two or three thousand dock-labourers, it extended like the spread of a conflagration, till, in an incredibly short time, more than a hundred thousand men were on strike. London was overawed by a multitude marching through her streets more numerous than many an army which has conquered kingdoms. Her trade, which is the astonishment of the world, was for a time paralysed. Hundreds of vessels lay idle in her docks and her great river, which were able neither to ship nor to unship their loads. Tens of thousands of pounds were lost every day. In the East-end of London streets were deserted and wharves were empty Two circumstances of the strike were specially memorable. One was that though myriads were suffering from the stress of hunger, and saw the pinched look on the faces of their wives and little children, and could only look forward to a future of terrible uncertainty, they yet abstained from acts of violence; and the leaders in whom they trusted were men who faithfully dissuaded them from every revolutionary measure to which they might have been goaded by the maddening stress of want. Another fact, full of the deepest significance for the future, was that the vast majority of the men on strike had no personal grievance. They acted on motives which, whether they were founded on mistaken views or not, were certainly full of chivalry, brotherliness, and self-denial. Though many of them were receiving high wages with which they were perfectly satisfied, they made common cause with the poor dockmen, and went out on strike;—a course which as they well knew might not only cause them present inconvenience, but might even imperil their future interests. They faced the risk with a generous desire to secure higher wages and less galling conditions for their suffering fellows.

When the strike was drawing to a close I received a letter from a workingman, a perfect stranger, whose name even was unknown to me, entreating me in warm terms to express my sympathy with the troubled and excited workers of East London. It may be worth while to record how the strike presented itself to an evidently honest and intelligent young artizan who had no personal share in it. He wrote as follows:

> "I beg in all faith and honesty to ask your aid in the present crisis of the strike. In the first place I am sure their cause is just, as I have had seventeen years' knowledge of them and their work. Mr. J. Burns, their champion and leader, is much loved and trusted by them. He is a total abstainer and non-smoker, and has formed them into a band of brothers ready to suffer any pains for the right. What the men now want to keep them together is a great spiritual leader. Mr. Burns has stirred up in them chivalric qualities hitherto undreamed of. Now is the time to arouse their spiritual faculties. I sympathise with them, heart and soul, as you would do if you could only see half the sacrifices they make for honour's sake. I have never seen the spirit of right and chivalry so stirred in them before. I feel certain that this is an opportunity to touch their souls. Will you not write a letter to their organ, or speak at their next meeting?"

I felt the force of the appeal, but for two reasons I was unable to take any step in the matter. The first was accidental. I had been travelling from the North of Ireland to the depths of Eskdale, where I was at a distance from any post. The letter was consequently delayed in transmission; and when I received it a week had elapsed since I had read a newspaper, and I did not even know whether the strike was over or not. The other reason was different. I saw that in hundreds of instances strikes had proved fatal to the best interests of the workingmen themselves. Sometimes strikes had been defeated, leaving behind them a long trail of indigence and misery. Sometimes they had succeeded, and their success had done worse harm by permanently disturbing the delicate relations between capital and labour; by causing great works to be closed, and so throwing multitudes out of permanent employment; and—which was the most fatal result of all—by driving important industries entirely out of the kingdom, and thus proving a benefit to other countries at the expense of our own at the very time when the strain of international competition is becoming constantly more severe.

A clergyman ought instinctively to regard himself as a champion of the poor and the oppressed when their cause is just. Christ was a poor man among the poor. He chose for His lot on earth the shop of the carpenter and the boat of the fisherman. He pronounced his beatitude upon the lowly, and invited to Himself the heavy laden. But one whose function is that of a religious teacher is specially bound to do nothing rash. The very sympathy which he feels with the unfortunates should check him from encouraging any action which may tend in the long run to ruin the interests which he desires to serve. The strike of the dock-labourers raised questions which perplexed the wisest philanthropists and the profoundest political economists; and it was impossible for one who was not upon the spot, and had made no special study of the whole question, to take any active part by thrusting himself with insufficient knowledge into a struggle of which the ultimate issues appeared to be so momentous.

But the phenomena of the strike ought to bring other considerations very forcibly home to the minds of all who love the Church of England, of all who believe in the faith of Christ.

For every one, I think, will admit that neither the Church of England nor any other religious bodies went for much in the mind of those hundred thousand workingmen. Cardinal Manning did indeed produce a deeply favourable impression, and is always foremost in every good social work.

His influence was nothing short of a national boon, and the Bishop of London seconded the noble effort of the Cardinal. But with this and one or two other exceptions, neither as corporate bodies, not by the action of their individual members, did any of the sects or churches wield any potent influence over this vast social movement. No one referred to them; no one consulted them. The leaders of the great associated strike were not in the least recognizable by their adherence to any special form of religious belief. No one ever dreamed of calling in the intervention of Bishops or any body of Church dignitaries or Dissenting ministers to act as arbitrators. Of the hundred thousand artizans who demonstrated in Hyde Park, or paraded the streets of the East-end, it is very doubtful if ten per cent. regularly attended any Christian assembly, or acknowledged the immediate authority of any religious community. By the confession of the Church of England, and of all other Christian bodies, the working-classes as a whole have "lapsed" or drifted away from the influence of the Church.

Do we realize what that means?

It does not mean that the working-classes as a whole are godless, but it does mean that they have cut themselves loose from many of the best aids and incentives to godliness. It does not mean that they hate religion, but it does mean that in the current forms of religion they do not find the blessings and consolations which are the best support and the richest boon of life. It does not mean that they have no hope and are without God in the world, but it does mean that they lose the divinely appointed way of keeping God ever before them, and that their hopes are in constant danger of being drowned in the muddy and shallow deluge of daily misery and struggle.

Ought we to be content with this state of things? Are we doing our duty if we make no effort to recover the lost ground and to keep pace with the rising tide of population?

Optimists will say, "We have the Parochial system, and the clergy were never more active than at present."

Few men have a higher estimate of the value of the Parochial system than I have, but I must say plainly that if we consider it adequate to the needs of these days we are under a complete delusion.

The working of the Parochial system is admirable for the requirements of the ordinary pastorate. Nothing better could be devised for ministrations to those who are faithful members of the Church. But it is not evangelistic, it is not aggressive. In thousands of parishes it breaks down quite hopelessly, partly because their numbers are so unmanageable that most of the parishioners never see their clergyman at all; partly because in great cities the parochial unity has been absolutely obliterated. What are we to say of parishes of ten, or even twenty thousand people who do not and will not contribute enough to pay for the warming and the lighting of their own church? who refuse to subscribe as much as £10 a year to maintain their own schools? who allow their struggling and burdened vicar to provide out of his own pocket the stipends of the curates whom he is forced to engage, not to lighten his own labours but to meet the spiritual needs of his people? What are we to say of parishes of many thousands, under good and able men, which yet cannot muster more than a handful of communicants, and cannot send up more than a dozen or two candidates for confirmation? England is becoming a nation of great cities. There are parishes which in ten years have quintupled their population. If we trust to the Parochial system alone to maintain the cause of religion among these teeming multitudes we are leaning upon a broken reed. Much too of what is vaunted as the increased activity among the clergy is purely functional. It consists in the multiplication of services and the elaboration of ceremonies. If a clergyman has daily service, it is supposed that he *must* be doing good work. Yet what is the practical value of the daily service, when, after being fully tried for years, the entire congregation consists (as I have known to be the case) of a single idiot, sitting with a book before him upside down; or of the bell-ringer and two old women; or of four young ladies, the daughters of the vicar; or of the schoolmaster alone, so that, as one vicar said to me, "I daily read the service to the congregation, and the congregation reads the lessons to me"? Functions, and ceremonies, and services may be admirable in their place, but they will never do the work achieved either by St. Paul, or by Francis of Assisi, or by Wesley and Whitefield. Our Sunday services are delightful to the educated and the faithful; but the unanimous voice of a body of hard-working East-end London clergymen assures us that "Neither in length nor in structure, nor in language is our liturgy adapted to the needs of the working-classes. It offers them that which they do not understand, and for which they do not care."

I say then that unless we are prepared to try other resources, to put into play new, more varied, and more energetic agencies, the influence of the Church among the working-classes, which is already at so low an ebb, will soon cease to exist altogether. We are living in a fool's Paradise if we flatter ourselves that the much-boasted revival of "Church principles" has made any impression on that vast multitude who are hardly to be called a class at all, but are rather the very backbone of the nation. A crowded church will be found in every large parish where the vicar is a good preacher and is beloved, quite irrespectively of whether he is High, or Low, or Broad. An impressive or gorgeous ritual, to say nothing of its expensiveness, will never of itself fill any church with workingmen, or produce any sort of effect upon them. The one thing which can and will reach them is *personal influence ;* and to that they are always amenable, whether it come from a Frederick Robertson or a Father Lowder, from Maurice or Mackonochie, from Simeon or Dean Stanley. The poorer masses will never be reached by a particular set of views or practices ; they will always be favourably influenced by earnest men.

Now it is this personal influence which cannot on any adequate scale be brought to bear by the parochial clergy in large and densely crowded parishes. It is not in one case out of a hundred that they get any real hold of the workingmen in a mass, though they may reach a few. The parochial clergy are rarely well off. They are married ; they are incessantly occupied by meetings, addresses, classes, and organizations of all kinds. They get hold of the young in their schools, but they almost inevitably lose sight of the youths of both sexes immediately after their first communion. A large parish needs the exclusive work of one clergyman merely to keep touch with the young men ; and to do this requires gifts and sympathies which perhaps no member of the clerical staff—even if he could be spared from other duties—may happen to possess. Yet the youths of both sexes constitute one of the most important classes of the community, and if they be lost sight of, it may well happen that they soon cease to be members of the Church in anything but name.

What, then, is the remedy ?

There is no one formal remedy, but every remedy which can be brought to bear may be summed up in the *extension of the personal influence of high-minded, faithful, and educated men.*

Mankind has never been delivered by committees or organizations. Ultimately it has always been the individual who has flashed into other souls the electric impulse which has pervaded his own. The purification of corrupt societies, the conversion of barbarous races, the redemption of intolerable wrongs, has always begun with the action of a single heart, and the self-sacrifice of the one evokes the enthusiasm of the many. St. Antony, St. Benedict, St. Columba, St. Francis of Assisi, Savonarola, Luther, St. Francis Xavier, St. Vincent de Paul, John Howard, Wesley, William Carey, John Pounds, William Lloyd Garrison, Lord Shaftesbury—take away these names from the history of Christendom, and delete the influence they exercised, and modern Europe might still have been a chaos of barbarism and cruelty, of vice and superstition.

And what were the two great wings with which every one of them soared above the dead-level of their contemporaries, and uplifted with them their suffering and degraded fellow-men ? They were the two great wings of enthusiasm and self-denial.

Enthusiasm and self-denial cannot be had to order, but in the hearts of good men there is a vast reserve-force of both, and they are called forth by special needs. When the hour has struck, the man is usually forthcoming. The hour *has* struck, and the Church anxiously awaits the man who shall have the requisite power to organize that which cannot fail to be a mighty movement.

Such a man, looking back at the annals of the past, will see that the great work of human amelioration, the conversion of the heathen, the recovery of the lapsed, the arousing of selfish and luxurious societies, can never be accomplished by proxy or by subscription lists, or by an office and paid secretaries, or by languid, advertising, and perfunctory associations. It can only be achieved by toil of heart and brain, by agonies and energies, by men who look neither for honour nor even for success, by men who work in faith and to whom the work is the reward. It was thus that gladiatorial shows were abolished, that slaves were emancipated, that prisons were purified, that drunkards were reclaimed, that factory children were rescued. And in almost every instance the work has been done by men who were not only singlehearted by nature, but who could devote themselves exclusively to their one main task by setting aside all personal ends, and keeping themselves disentangled from the cares of life.

When a great work has been begun, it becomes too large for a single worker. It is taken up by those who imitate his example, who band themselves into a community animated by the same high desire. But if the community is to carry out the work of their head or founder, they must be bound by similar conditions. And those conditions of exclusive devotion to one great end, resolve themselves mainly into three: the old vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience, which in past ages added so vast a potency to individual self-sacrifice.

And at this point many will start back disgusted and terrified by the proposal. They will say Monasticism in age after age has proved itself a deadly failure. Would you, in defiance of the plain lessons of History, propose to re-introduce it into that Church of England by which the spirit of it has been deliberately rejected?

I answer that I should regard the re-introduction of all that is meant by "Monasticism" into the Church of England as a frightful calamity. Even as early as the fourth century the records of the Church begin to teem with shameful stories, like those about wicked, sensual and greedy monks which are recorded by St. Jerome and other Fathers. St. Augustine, enamoured as he was of the cœnobitic life, and though he unwisely endeavoured to enforce it upon his clergy, yet confesses that if some of the best men he had ever known had been monks, so too had some of the worst. Monasticism may be possible to the saintly few, and they may secure its best conditions for themselves without leaving their own houses; but as an institution for many it has been stamped by History with fierce and emphatic disapprobation.

But the Brothers of the Poor whose establishment is in contemplation will not be monks in any sense of the word. The first and fundamental difference between them and monks will be this, that their vows will never be permitted to be permanent. They will be voluntary; they will be temporary; they will be dispensable; they will never be undertaken for more than five years; they may at any time be laid aside. By this means the Brotherhood will be saved from the intolerable curse of the monasteries, the misery and corruption of men who were unequal to their vows and had mistaken their vocation. Further, the life of the Brothers will be active, not contemplative; public, not secluded; enlivened by constant and cheerful intercourse with their fellow-men, not shut up in cells; busy with energetic beneficence, not swallowed up by seven services a day. It will be a life spent in the very midst of the world, not entirely withdrawn from it. The one aim of the Brothers, lay and clerical, will be to serve, and to win, and to elevate, and to purify others; not to absorb themselves in the contemplation of how best to save their own souls. For the time that they are members of any Brotherhood they will live, gladly and unencumbered, as poor men among the poor. Their single rooms will be among the abodes of the poor, and will be always open to the poor. They will be the friends of the poor, not separated from them by abysses of external respectability, nor removed from the possibility of fully understanding the condition of their life. They will be face to face and shoulder to shoulder with the working-classes, earning their full confidence by manifesting unstinted sympathy with them in their needs and sorrows. They will not be crude, brawling, uneducated evangelists, with a stock of fluent and ignorant shibboleths, but gentlemen, men educated at our public schools and Universities, men of knowledge and refinement, who will be ready to make a cheerful sacrifice of the interests which most men hold so dear and in which they find so little satisfaction, for the sake of winning back the great masses of their fellow-countrymen in crowded cities to the inheritance of blessings which myriads are rapidly losing or have already lost. If they undertake this mission in the right spirit they cannot fail; and if they succeed, they will become the saviours of our modern civilization.

I believe that two or three thousand of such workers, costing the Church nothing, appealing for no funds, accepting no subscriptions, living (and that in perfect comfort) on £40 or £50 a year, derived either exclusively from their own private means, or given them by those who send them to their work, would produce an incalculable change in the future destinies of the Church of England, and therefore of England herself and of the world. They might diminish that horrible scourge of drunkenness, which is the worst curse of the working-classes, and which drags them down into abysses out of which they can never rise until they have emancipated themselves from the tyranny of the ginshop. They might deepen, and in many regions create afresh by their example, the lost ideal of purity, and save London from the disgrace and shipwreck of all that is best in human life, caused by the multitudes of fallen women who are now, alas! to be numbered by tens of thousands. They might grapple effectually with the subtle and spreading evil of betting and gambling, and might help to dissipate the intolerable dulness and dreariness which now takes refuge in these spurious forms of excitement. Above all, the work and example of men whose lives were obviously devoted to the good of the poor at the spontaneous sacrifice of their own gain, could not fail to win the confidence of the great body of the people. Confidence, as the great statesman said, is a plant of slow growth. At present the clergy as a body do not possess the confidence of the people either in the country or in the cities. They have failed to convince them that the labours of the clergy should be *mainly* in the service of the poor because the poor are the more in number; and that they have a Gospel for the poor which neither Socialists nor men of science can offer them. It is more than doubtful whether this lost confidence can be won back by any of the present agencies. New efforts, new sacrifices are needed—new, yet in their method and spirit as old as Christianity itself—before the mass of the people can see those days of the Son of Man which they have lost, and for which in their inmost hearts they sigh. If any can suggest better or safer expedients to restore the religious life of the multitude than by the formation of Brotherhoods such as I have here indicated, let them not be contented to object and to criticize, but let them tell us what is needful.

> "Si quid novisti rectius istis
> Candidus imperti; si non his utere mecum."

The Southern House of Convocation has passed a unanimous resolution to the effect that the time has come when the Church can welcome the aid of such Brotherhoods; but it has not yet pledged itself to any details of their organization. This cannot be done till the next Session of Convocation in May 1890. But if the sanction of the Upper and Lower Houses be given to the formation of a body such as is contemplated in this paper, there can be little doubt that some one will come forward who will endeavour to lead the movement and to organize the work of Brethren of the Poor in parishes and dioceses where such work would be welcomed. Many of the Bishops have already expressed their approval of the plan, and if it be carried out under wise and favourable auspices, I am one of those who feel strongly convinced that it will bring to bear upon the religious needs of the multitude a force no less mighty than that which was exercised by the early followers of St. Benedict, or the Minorites of St. Francis, or the Poor Priests of Wycliffe, or the Piagnoni of Savonarola, or the order of St. Vincent de Paul, or those whom John Wesley sent forth throughout the length and breadth of England to awaken the torpor of a selfish and slumbering Church.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN AMERICA.

BY J. E. C. BODLEY.

From *The Nineteenth Century*, London, November, 1889.

THE students of the Collegj Esteri at Rome are not in appearance an athletic race. They are a familiar feature of the Eternal City as they promenade somewhat listlessly its thoroughfares in groups of two and three, attired in the uniform of their various nationalities. The British tourist, as he suns himself on the Pincian Hill on a Sunday morning while his wife and daughters have gone to the English church at the Porta del Popolo, eyes askance what he calls their monkish garb, and as he unfolds his *Times* to read the correspondence on "Compulsory Athletics" he devoutly thanks heaven that his young barbarians at Harrow and Oxford are not as these students. Even to the more sympathetic observer these pale seminarists do not give the impression of being in training for the life of endurance which the main body of the Church Militant imposes on its officers wherever stationed, whether in the slums of Westminster or in the fever-stricken camps of Tonkin or in the swamps of the Zambesi river.

Such being the characteristic of these young ecclesiastics, the proceedings of a group of them surprised me not a little one sunny afternoon in the spring of 1887 on the flowery greensward of the Pamphilj Doria gardens. There, in an open space cleared among the ilex trees, a band of them, with cassocks turned up, were engaged in an active game. Its nimble mysteries were unfamiliar to English eyes, but the scientific manner in which a ball was thrown convinced me that the players were no foreigners. It is an ethnological fact that the Anglo-Saxon race alone is capable of propelling a missile in the method known as "shying." The young Disraeli, who had nothing of the Anglo-Saxon in his wonderful nature, gives expression to this, when witing to his father from Malta how some British officers playing rackets had struck a ball to where he was sitting, and how he picked it up and requested "a rifleman to forward its passage, as I really had never thrown a ball in my life." There was no need, therefore, to accost the players in Italian or in French, so, to my question to one of them, "Pray tell me who you are and what you are doing?" was made the answer in the unmistakable intonation of New England, "We are the American College, Sir, and we are playing at base-ball."

This was my first acquaintance with the Catholic Church of the United States, and it was a typical instance of the intensely national idiosyncrasy of that great branch of the Church Universal that its students sent from the New World to be imbued with the tradition of the Old should have been playing their American base-ball beneath the very shadow of St. Peter's.

On the shores of the western hemisphere nearest to Europe the first conspicuous landmark which from the Atlantic meets the traveller's eye are the lofty towers of a Catholic cathedral. Over Newfoundland, the outpost of the North American continent, the British flag flies, so that branch of the Catholic Church which set up the massive edifice crowning the heights above the Narrows of St. John's is not within the jurisdiction of the fathers, who are this month celebrating the centennial of their hierarchy at Baltimore, in the city which took its name from the first Governor of this colony, and thence, as we travel on the mainland westward for 3,000 miles till the Pacific is reached, the ecclesiastical provinces into which the vast Dominion of Canada is divided are in the same case. A passing glance, therefore, must suffice for these most interesting organisations with their marked distinctive features.

The Roman Catholic Church claims one half of the busy population of Newfoundland, and they to a man are of Irish extraction. The French rivals of these much-enduring fisher-folk are also Catholics, but they are only summer itinerants on the French shore which they occupy under treaty right, and at the close of the cod-fishing season they retire to their islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon or even recross the Atlantic to Brittany for the winter. Consequently there is not one French priest in the island. The clergy who work under that wise and amiable Irishman Bishop Power of St. John's and his colleagues have no sinecure. Excepting on the peninsula of Avalon, the interior of Newfoundland is uninhabited, and the clergy have to minister to a population scattered over a rock-bound coast along which fogs and icebergs are a daily peril of their parochial voyages. These serfs of a harsh truck-system, though Ireland is their fatherland, are totally unlike the Irish immigrants, who are one of the largest elements of the population throughout Greater Britain, such as are largely represented in Toronto and other dioceses of Upper Canada.

On the way to French Canada a little settlement is passed near the entrance to the Gulf of St. Lawrence which deserves a word of mention. The counties of Pictou and Antigonish on the north coast of Nova Scotia resemble the province of Quebec in the fact that a considerable proportion of their inhabitants can speak no English. French, however, is not their tongue but Gaelic, and among them are found a probably greater number of Gaelic-speaking Catholic Highlanders than in the whole of Scotland.

The fair province which skirts the waters of the St. Lawrence was called by Frontenac and the founders of Quebec "La nouvelle France," but Quebec has survived the old *régime* whose impress she bears, and now is the only bit of "La vieille France" that the world contains—"La vieille France in its most refined, Catholic, and devout age," as Cardinal Manning once wrote to me. There are quiet towns in France such as Laon and Soissons, which outwardly have an old-world look, but in the beautiful cathedrals of the old twin cities of l'Aisne the clergy and the Suisses are oftenest the only men who assist at High Mass. At Quebec, the most nobly planted city of the western hemisphere, all is different. The Church is omnipresent. The view of the grey buildings seen from one's windows takes one back to the beginning of the last century, and the sight of a daily newspaper scarcely removes the illusion, for the little French journal under its "Faits divers" announces a miracle which took place last week in a neighbouring village, and in an official column advertises the sentence of excommunication read on Sunday by the curé of St. Joseph at Lévis upon a luckless couple who have been defying Divine law and human conventionality.

Even the pastimes of the faithful are fashioned according to the *ancien régime*, or, at all events, certain modern forms of amusement are strictly banned. The Governor-General is in residence at his summer quarters, and the maidens of Quebec implore for a dispensation for a ball at the Citadel. All in vain: they are sternly referred to the official manual on *Les danses et les bals*, a grim little tract which commences with the severe proposition that "La danse et les bals, comme ils se font ordinairement, sont un scandale et un danger," and under the heading of "Les danses immodestes" they may read "sont réputées telles les danses modernes connues sous les noms de Valse, Polka, Galop, Cancan et autres semblables." It must not from this be imagined that the last named of these "danses vives" is a usual feature of the programmes of viceregal or other polite festivities in Canada, and why the good curé of N.D. de Quebec should have bracketed it with the other less volatile measures is a mystery. Perhaps the Highland reel was danced in Lord Lorne's time, and was mistaken for it; but this is only conjecture. At all events the maidens of Quebec refuse to be consoled with the historical fact that Madame de Maintenon never danced the polka.

The Church in Lower Canada not only regulates the lives and occupations of the people, but it directs the politics of the province. That it represents no mere faction is shown by the attitude of the Federal Parliament at Ottawa whenever the Provincial Assembly legislates on the Church's behalf. The Jesuits' Estates Bill gives 400,000 dollars out of the treasury to the Church in compensation for the property of the society which escheated to the government subsequent to the suppression of the Order by Clement XIV. The powerful Orange lodges of Ontario have set the country ablaze with an agitation this year, which has swept out of sight commercial union, the fisheries, and every other Canadian question, urging the Dominion Parliament to recommend the veto of the bill. But Sir John Macdonald, our Canadian Premier, himself an Orangeman, is the astutest statesman on the American continent, and he knows that in French Canada the Church and the people are one and indivisible. Hence in the Parliament at Ottawa, with its Protestant majority in a house of over 200 members, only thirteen could be found to vote for the disallowance of the bill.

Amid the bitter strife of creeds the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec maintains the respect and confidence of the Protestant minority of the province (which includes most of the wealthy and educated of the border city of Montreal), so much so that it has been seriously suggested in Protestant quarters that for the protection of the minority it would be advantageous if representative institutions in Quebec were abolished, and the government of the province invested in Cardinal Taschereau. The Jesuits have great influence in Lower Canada, and they are not universally beloved among their co-religionists, but the hold which both the person and the office of the Archbishop of Quebec has upon the affection and imagination of the populace is daily made manifest. The scene on the day of the installation of the Cardinal after his return from Rome, whither he had been summoned to receive the scarlet hat, was most memorable, when, amid the roar of artillery and the clang of bells, he gave from the balcony of the Basilica the benediction to the kneeling multitude.

Cardinal Taschereau is not a man of the people, as are some of his most capable suffragans and colleagues. Monseigneur Duhamel, the able and refined Archbishop of Ottawa, is a fine example of the best type of *habitant*, a Canadian in everything, even to the pronunciation of his native language. The Cardinal, on the other hand, is a courtly French prelate of the last century. A visit at the old palace is a ceremony of some solemnity. The Vicar-General Père Legaré with graceful urbanity welcomes the visitor in a sumptuous chamber hung with the portraits of the occupants of the see of Quebec for more than two hundred years, beginning with Laval and St. Vallier, till the Cardinal enters, in his robes of scarlet and violet. For an hour the dignified old man discourses in the stately French of the last century, which seems alive again. At one moment his talk is of the decadence of the times, the perniciousness of modern literature, but it sounds as if a prelate of old France were deprecating the growing license of the more recent works of the author of the *Henriade* or lamenting that Crébillon's dramas were supplanting the masterpieces of Racine. The only inharmonious note is the modern costume of the Cardinal's visitor: for the rest the scene is such as is sometimes portrayed on the walls of the Salon—it is *Une audience chez son Éminence sous Louis Quinze.*

I have lingered too long in the fascinating region of Quebec, but Cardinal Taschereau will be referred to again in connection with Cardinal Gibbons, so it is as well to give some slight impression of the head of the mother Church of America and of his surroundings.

The Church in Ontario has been mentioned, so, hastening westward, we will not pause until the great lakes are passed and Winnipeg is reached. A few years hence Manitoba may be as populous as Illinois, but at present the work of the Church is chiefly missionary in its character. Archbishop Taché's suffragans are Frenchmen, not French Canadians, and there is a vast dissimilarity between the domestic *habitants* of Quebec and the half-breed Métis of the North-West, who are by degrees giving way to immigrant settlers from every nation of

Europe. Still further westward we go to the Foothills of the Rockies, where the venerable Père Lacombe is ending his days among the Indians who call him father. The prairies are left behind and the fastnesses of the mountains are entered. The Canadian Pacific cars thunder through the passes twice a day, but ten years ago they had been trodden by the feet of no white men, with one exception. As the train winds through the magnificent valley of the Fraser, here and there on mountain tops may be seen, black against the sky, a rude cross which marks an Indian burying-ground, consecrated in these solitudes by the missionaries of Rome.

The passage over English territory from Atlantic to Pacific is highly interesting as displaying the varied capabilities and characteristics of the two greatest organisations the world has ever seen—the British Empire and the Church of Rome. At each stage of the journey the Church Universal is seen justifying its title of Catholicity by its adaptability to the nature and the needs of each varying community. The Dominion of Canada, federated under the British flag, presents within its limits differences almost as marked as those which distinguish from one another the States of Europe. The Church of Rome observes precisely the same ritual, framed in identical language, for a little band of Blackfeet Indians kneeling in a log-hut in the far west, as it uses for a French congregation in the Basilica at Quebec or for the Irish immigrants who worship in Toronto Cathedral; but the Church in Lower Canada differs in mode of thought and manners of its members as widely from the Church in Ontario as do the Catholic Catalonians of Barcelona from the Catholic Flemings of Antwerp. Within a few hours' journey from Vancouver in the west and from Montreal in the east a frontier is crossed beyond which an entirely different state of things is found. The American nation, though sprung from sources more heterogeneous than those of the inhabitants of the Dominion, are completely homogeneous in language, in sentiment, and in economy of life. The New York millionaire, the Texan ranche-man, the farmer of Vermont, or the planter of Louisiana is above all things a citizen of the United States whether his ancestors were British or Batavian, Teutonic or Scandinavian, whether his religion be Papist or Presbyterian, Episcopalian or Methodist, and the members of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the Union are stamped with unmistakable national characteristics as were the base-ball-playing seminarists in the Pamphilj Doria gardens.

Almost fifty years have passed since Macaulay wrote: "There is not and there never was on earth a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church." In the interval, the Holy See has lost its sovereignty over a strip of Italian territory: the troops of the Empire which was the bastard offspring of the French Revolution no longer garrison the Castle of St. Angelo, but the Church, if it has lost the temporal sway of a province, has gained spiritual dominion all over the face of the earth, and that by the indirect agency of the chief Protestant race of the world.

That the Anglo-Saxon is the most vigorous race which the world has ever seen is shown by the ease with which it is imposing the English language on all peoples with which it intermingles—not by conquest, as in the case of some of the Roman colonies, not by penal coercion, as in that of the French Huguenots at the Cape, whose language was stamped out by the Boers, but simply by contact. The American nation affords the great exemplification of this process. In the British Empire it is being carried out, though less conspicuously; but in the United States, where probably less than one half of the inhabitants are of purely British descent, it is so complete that the grandchildren of Germans who spoke no word of English will talk to an Englishman of the Elizabethan literature as "our common inheritance." It may be urged that the Irish Catholics have done as much as the Anglo-Saxons in making English the *lingua franca* of half the world's surface. This is in a sense true, but the Irish are not, strictly speaking, a colonising race. The Irish, like the Germans, are splendid settlers, and Greater Britain would have been a comparatively small domain without their prolific aid; but since the days when Spain and Portugal made South America a Catholic continent, the Anglo-Saxon race alone has founded colonies successfully. The Catholic countries of Europe have ceased to colonise, but the Church of Rome has not suffered thereby. Such is her marvellous vitality and energy that in these last fifty years she has made progress in English-speaking countries, which perhaps in the end will be of greater moment than all her previous achievements, establishing herself in the newest colonies founded by Protestant England, and extending her sway within that part of the North American continent which two centuries earlier was colonised by Protestant Englishmen.

Mr. Gladstone has been taken to task, it is difficult to see why, for his recent prediction in Paris, that a century hence the American nation will be "the great organ of the powerful British tongue." We are all hopeful for the future of the British Empire, but the future of the British Empire is fraught with anxious uncertainty, whereas the pathway of the American Republic is unobstructed and clear, and it seems to be humanly certain that in less than a hundred years' time it will be the most populous civilised nation of the world, and the greatest in material prosperity. Its difficulties ahead, which are remarked by its men of foresight and by outside critics, are not such as are likely to interfere with either of those consummations. Mr. Gladstone's estimate of the population of the United States a century hence was 600,000,000. Although we are familiar with similar prodigious figures in reference to the teeming hordes of the Chinese Empire, it is almost impossible to grasp the idea of myriads in connection with Western civilisation, still less of such numbers being gathered together in one nation, speaking our own English language. If the greatness of nations is to be gauged merely by population and commercial prosperity, there can be no doubt that America is fated to take the foremost place among nations, but it will only be set up in that high place when the peoples of the Old World, with their literature and historic traditions, shall have abdicated their position by consenting to the doctrine that numbers and material wealth alone constitute the greatness of a State.

In the relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the American nation we have, then, one of the most interesting phenomena it is possible to conceive—the contact of the most venerable and powerful organisation of the old order with the most advanced and prosperous community of the new. In all the varied history of the Church of Rome she has never had the experience which in the United States she has encountered during the hundred years since the establishment of the American hierarchy. In the Old World the old civilisation has grown up side by side with her, and there is no page of the history of Europe which is not marked with the Fisher's seal. Nor has her activity been confined to the civilised places of the earth. On virgin soil she has worked with self-denying enterprise in every quarter of the globe, and the early history of the remoter parts of the great American continent is the record of the Jesuit fathers and the other missionary pioneers of Rome. But in the United States the Church finds itself in the midst of a new civilisation, of the highest type as regards the diffusion of education and material comfort through all classes, though imperfect by reason of the nation never having passed through the discipline of youth to its precocious manhood, since in America there has been no slow development from barbarism through mediævalism to a ripe civilisation. The Church which in the Old World has assisted at the birth and death of empires and principalities—crowning kings, upsetting dynasties, and hastening revolutions—here in the New World, amid a transplanted society, knows nothing of treaties and frontiers, nothing of wars of succession and State intrigue. It is in America that she seems to have the greatest opportunity of realising the admonition of her Founder, "Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo."

Americans of culture frequently lament that theirs is not a land of lofty ideals. Perhaps no nation—as a nation—has a high ideal; but in England and France and Germany (though this is no golden age of literature) we have teachers who take us out of the traffic of the market-place. In America, unfortunately, literature seems almost to have come to an end. The brilliant band of New Englanders, most of whom came out from Harvard College, has nearly disappeared, and few successors are forthcoming. The blight which has fallen on American authorship seems like a nemesis for the iniquitous copyright laws, which are a remarkable expression of the lack of moral sense of the nation. The Church of Rome has a new experience in exerting her influence among this too shrewd, too practical, too prosperous people, the most characteristic offspring of the nineteenth century. Men may disapprove the methods of the Catholic Church and discredit her beliefs, but few will deny that her ideal is the most perfect ever set before the human race.

The American nation, again, is lacking in tradition. The soil of the United States—or, at all events, a portion of it—has an independent history of a hundred years, but the mass of the people only inherit it by adoption. American art seems to have exhausted itself in pictorial representations of Generals Burgoyne and Lord Cornwallis in humiliating situations; but few of the ancestors either of the painters of historical pictures or of the patriots who deliver Fourth of July orations bled in the Revolutionary War on the side of the colonists. When the capitulations at Saratoga and Yorktown took place, they were passing their boyhood as compatriots of Robert Emmet, and hearing how Lord Edward Fitzgerald had been wounded by the American rebels at Eutaw Springs, or were watching the last days of their monarch, Frederick the Great, and growing up to be the foes of the French allies of young America.

These are some of the attributes which the Church of Rome has to bestow upon the American nation. In return, that great people is investing the Church with an endowment of greater magnitude than the most hopeful enthusiast for the spread of the Roman Catholic religion ever dreamed of, and one which is likely to revolutionise Christendom. Of all the languages of Europe which have influenced civilisation, English, for historical causes, has been spoken by fewer Roman Catholics than any other tongue. English-speaking Catholics have been a comparatively small body, the majority of whom, as recently as half a century ago, were persons actually born in Ireland. The growth of the American nation, as the largest organ of the English language, is completely changing the position of our tongue among the millions who follow the faith of Rome. The expansion of England in her colonies is assisting towards this remarkable issue, but the United States is the chief instrument in bringing about the result, which men of this generation will live to see, of the Church of Rome having a greater number of its active members speaking English than any other living language.

As it is impossible to treat of one of the great influences which regulate the conduct of a nation without expressing some opinion upon the people, I should like, though perhaps needlessly, to disclaim any spirit of censoriousness in my necessarily imperfect observations. Americans are said to be hypersensitive with regard to English criticism, and small wonder if they are so, considering the *de haut en bas* tone assumed by many of our countrymen when speaking or writing about American institutions. It is true that there is a small section of American society which, by its singular admiration for, and imitation of, what is least laudable in English manners and customs, lays itself out as the object of British patronising airs, but the unworthier forms of Anglomania do not count for much in a population of sixty millions. There are no people on the face of the earth who are more willing than are Americans to discuss with outsiders their own foibles and to listen with generous endurance to strictures upon them, provided their critics approach the subject as amateurs of human nature, and not with that air of superiority which may be the secret of England's greatness, but which also is the secret of our being the best-hated nation in the world.

My impression is that Americans are much less tolerant of criticism from their countrymen than from strangers. Bishop Potter's great sermon on the hundredth anniversary of Washington's inauguration, which came like a warning peal of thunder amid the crackle of the centennial fireworks, was received as a thunderstorm would be by a holiday crowd assembled for a pyrotechnic exhibition. Mr. Henry James, it is said, would, if recognised at Schenectady, receive at the hands of the survivors of the family of Mr. Ezra B. Miller a reception similar to that experienced at Tarascon by a luckless *commis voyageur*, who registered his name at the "Empereurs" as A. Daudet, and was chivied to the station and almost into the Rhone by the outraged comrades of the immortal Tartarin. Mr. Matthew Arnold—"We still had Thyrsis then"—gave less offence by his own comments on things American than he caused by quoting from Emerson, at the conclusion of his lecture at Boston on the philosopher of Concord, the presumably well-known sentence, "great, intelligent, sensual, avaricious America;" but it was whispered that the culture of Massachusetts, which is said to be in the habit of murmuring snatches of Emerson in its sleep, actually did not recognise the passage as an excerpt from their master.

In the early spring of 1887, when the students of the American College were playing their national game in sight of the Vatican, grave events were taking place within its walls, in the interest of the Catholic Church in the United States. Cardinal Gibbons was in Rome. In the June of the previous year he had been created cardinal, and his presence, for the purpose of being invested with his title and the red berretta, was causing the liveliest curiosity among the American tourists wintering in the Holy City. There was a lady from Chicago (Chicago people declared that she came from St. Louis) whose gratification at having seen the new Cardinal knew no bounds. "He is one of the most intelligent of our citizens," she remarked, "and is the author of the best book about Rome, any way, and I'm going right away to the store in the Piazza di Spagna, to see if they have gotten a Tauchnitz copy of his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.*"

To stimulate the taste for bibliography of his western compatriots was not, however, even the ulterior object of Cardinal Gibbons's visit to Rome. On the 7th of June, 1886, two scarlet hats were assigned to North America, the head of the Canadian hierarchy being called to the Sacred College on the same day as the Primate of the United States. Some months later an event unprecedented in the history of Christendom took place when two princes of the Church crossed the Atlantic Ocean in one vessel. The voyage together of the two cardinals on the French packet from New York to Havre was a most dramatic situation, inasmuch as one of them was about to make his official visit to Rome the occasion for moving the Congregation of the Holy Office to rescind a decree which it had pronounced at the instance of the other. Two archiepiscopal travelling companions surely never found themselves in such a remarkable position: regarding one another with sentiments of affectionate respect, equal in their loyalty to the Church, and of equal authority in her councils, summoned to Rome to receive the highest reward in her gift (save the triple tiara), these powerful chiefs of neighbouring hierarchies were about to approach the Holy Office with petitions of irreconcilable tenor. The Archbishop of Quebec's mission was an easier one than that of the Archbishop of Baltimore. Cardinal Taschereau had only to advise the Supreme Congregation to follow out tradition by adhering to a delivered judgment. Cardinal Gibbons had undertaken the prodigious task of moving the Holy See to go back upon its own decision.

A month before the two Archbishops were created Cardinals, there was read in all the churches of Lower Canada the following "mandement," issued by Monseigneur Taschereau :—

> Having learned that the delegates of a society known as the Knights of Labour have tried to recruit members in parts of this province, we deem it our duty, brethren, to put you on your guard against it, and mark, we do not speak in our own name, but in that of the Holy See, whose advice we have sought. In October 1885 we sent to Rome an authentic copy of the rules and constitutions of that society. The Congregation of the Holy Office, having examined them with all due precaution, sent us this answer, which should be for you an absolute rule of conduct, and keep you away from the Society of the Knights of Labour :—" On account of the principles, organisation, and statutes of the Knights of Labour, that association is to be relegated among those which are prohibited by the Holy See."

Archbishop Gibbons at once grasped the importance of this proceeding. He summoned to Baltimore a Commission of the Archbishops of the United States, which decided by ten voices to two that neither justice nor prudence demanded the condemnation of the Knights of Labour, and sixty out of the remaining sixty-three bishops expressed the same opinion. The two Archbishops who voted for condemnation are prelates of exemplary piety, but neither of them can be considered to be in touch with the modern movement. One of them, the venerable Archbishop of St. Louis, was consecrated to that see half a century ago, when the Missouri was the boundary of the far west, remote from civilisation. The other, the Spanish Archbishop of Santa Fé, has for his diocese the wild territory of New Mexico, which supports only thirty-six secular priests, nearly all of whom are Spaniards or Mexicans.

In February 1887, after Cardinal Gibbons's arrival in Rome he presented to Cardinal Simeoni, the Prefect of the Propaganda, a memorandum which is one of the most statesmanlike documents ever penned by an American, and which takes a much wider scope of the questions involved than the mere consideration of the legality of any given organisation. A few quotations translated from this lengthy memorial must suffice. The Cardinal, with thoroughly American sentiment, remarks that an organisation the head of which has been called into conference by the President of the United States cannot be deemed hostile to authority. He then declares that the power of monopolies in America has made organised opposition necessary, and that "it is not only the right of workingmen to protect themselves, but it is the obligation of the entire people to assist them in finding a remedy for the dangers with which civilisation and social order are menaced by avarice, oppression, and corruption." Association, he says, is "in harmony with the genius of our country," and he discards as "neither possible nor necessary in our country" the idea of fraternities under the supervision of priests taking the place of purely industrial organisations wherein Catholics and Protestants meet on a common footing, which intermingling constitutes no danger to religion; "the only grave danger would arise from the alienation of her children from the Church, which nothing would occasion more certainly than imprudent condemnation." After some remarks on the ethics of strikes and the uselessness of hoping that violence can always be avoided in them, the Cardinal proceeds :—

> It is the part of Christian prudence to convert into a legitimate, peaceful, and beneficial competition that which a course of repellent severity would turn into a latent volcano such as society fears and the Church deplores in Europe. On this point I

> strongly insist because my intimate acquaintance with the social condition of our country profoundly convinces me that we are face to face with a question which not only concerns the rights of the working classes, who ought to be specially dear to the Church sent by our Divine Master to preach the gospel to the poor, but one which involves the most fundamental interests of the Church and of human society in the future. Everyone who ponders well the ways along which Divine Providence is guiding contemporary history must recognise the important part which the power of the people is playing and will play. . . . Hitherto our country has presented the picture of true democracy seeking the general prosperity by means of sound principles and social order. To preserve this admirable state of things it is absolutely necessary for religion to remain in possession of the affections of the multitude. As Cardinal Manning has well said, "In the future era the Church will have to deal not with Princes and Parliaments but with the masses." . . . Of all the glorious titles earned by the Church there is none which gives it greater influence than that of Friend of the People. Surely in our democratic nation this is the title which is winning for the Catholic Church not only the enthusiastic devotion of millions of her children, but the respect and admiration of all our citizens whatever their religious belief. . . . As the great questions of the future will not be those of war, of commerce, or of finance, but social questions which relate to the bettering of the condition of the masses, it is of sovereign importance for the Church to be found invariably and firmly ranged on the side of humanity.

The memorial concludes with an eloquent recapitulation of the dangers the Church will incur if she adheres to "the easy course" of condemning this labour organisation, not the least being "the accusation of being 'unamerican,' that is to say, foreign to our national sentiment—the most powerful arm the enemies of the Church can direct against her." The Holy See will be regarded not as a paternal power but as an unjust and tyrannical authority, while the social agitation will last as long as there are ills to remedy. The forms of organisation are necessarily only temporary. To strike at one of them would be to embark upon a war without system and without end. The American people regard with calm the progress of the social struggle, and "to speak out with the frankness imposed on me by my office, both prudence suggests and the dignity of the Church demands that we should not offer to America an ecclesiastical protection which she neither asks for nor thinks she has need of." As is well known, the result was that Cardinal Gibbons induced the Holy See to take the unprecedented course of revoking a sentence which had been recorded on the representation of the Primate of another hierarchy, a re-decision which appears the more remarkable the more the Cardinal's arguments are weighed, revealing as they do an opportunism of a type more advanced and enlightened than the Church has had the credit of sympathising with.

Near the old manor-house where once lived Charles Carroll, the latest survivor of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the kinsman of John Carroll, the first Catholic bishop in the United States, among the verdant woods and pastures of Maryland stands a college directed by a staff of Sulpician fathers. During one of my visits to Baltimore, one of these good French priests, a Rémois by birth, delighted to see a traveller who was familiar with the vine-clad hills of the Marne, confided to me the contrast he had experienced between the solemn ceremony attending an audience at the Archbishop's Palace at Reims and the kindly welcome the humblest priest was certain of receiving from the great American Cardinal at his "Residence." The old-fashioned unpretentious house, where a good deal of the world's history is being moulded, would be scorned by one of those sleek preachers of the gospel of sleekness who fatly flourish in certain American cities. For all that, Charles Street, Baltimore, has a dignity which Fifth Avenue will never attain to. Beacon Street, overlooking Boston Common, is in the springtime more beautiful, but there is an air of distinction not found in any other thoroughfare in the United States in the street which takes its name from the royal husband of Henrietta Maria, in whose honour Maryland was named. Baltimore itself was called after an English title which became extinct years before two-thirds of our present peerage existed, and its old world associations are not inappropriate for the head-quarters in the new world of the Church which is here initiating a work undreamed of by Cecil Calvert, or the daughter of Marie de' Medici, if the future of their faith ever exercised the minds of those seventeenth century Catholics.

A walk with the Cardinal through the tranquil streets of the residential quarter of Baltimore gives a vivid impression of the affection with which the Monumental City regards its distinguished son who was baptised and ordained in the Cathedral over which he now presides. Though Maryland is a Roman Catholic stronghold there is a vast Protestant population in its great commercial capital, yet, as the Cardinal passes along, nearly every hat is doffed to the simple citizen who has made a greater impression on European policy than any American of his generation. One day last spring we found ourselves in the midst of a congregation streaming out of a church, the architecture of which the Cardinal drew my attention to, while he responded to the salutations of the crowd. I naturally concluded that they were his own people, but no, he explained, "they are our Episcopalian friends." The determined prelate who was strong enough to lead the Vatican to reverse its own decision has nothing of narrow arrogance in his gentle nature, which loves to live in charity with all men. In his popular exposition of Catholic doctrine, "Faith of our Fathers," of which nearly two hundred thousand copies have been sold in thirteen years, though it is a controversial work, the Protestant sects are nowhere offensively referred to as heretics or schismatics, but as "my dissenting brethren."

The delicate youthfulness of the Cardinal's countenance makes it difficult to realise that he was a Bishop twenty-one years ago. A year later, when he was only thirty-five, he attended the Œcumenical Council and was one of the minority which voted against the promulgation of the Definition of Infallibility. I have heard him quote the impressive peroration of Cardinal Simor, the Primate of Hungary, in his speech opposing its adoption, "Hannibalis exercitus ad portas Romæ stat; equorum strepitum audio," prophetic words which were uttered a few months before the troops not of a foreign invader but of Victor Emmanuel were at the Porta Pia.

On the question of Church and State the Cardinal holds the view practically universal among Americans of all creeds, that the Church should be absolutely free from State control, and entirely dependent on voluntary support. He relates how, during the Second Empire, he once, on his way from Rome, visited the Bishop of Annecy in Savoy. "I was struck with the splendour of his palace, and saw a sentinel at the door, placed there by the French Government as a guard of honour. But the venerable Bishop soon disabused me of my favourable impressions. He told me he was in a state of gilded slavery; 'I cannot,' said he, 'build a sacristy without the permission of the government.' I never wish to see the day when the Church will invoke or receive government aid to build our churches or to pay our clergy: in proportion as State patronage would increase, the sympathy and aid of the faithful would diminish."

The biographer of Father Damien, with all his sympathy for the Church of Rome, gives, as one reason for his dissent from her communion, that she discourages the reading of the Bible by the laity, an impression shared by most Englishmen who passed their childhood twenty years ago or more. Mr. Clifford ought to have heard with me a sermon preached last March, of the tenor of which the following extract from the *Baltimore Sun* will give some idea:—

> Cardinal Gibbons preached at the Cathedral yesterday morning the first of the sermons he is going to deliver on Sundays in Lent. His subject was "Reading the Bible," to which he strongly urged his hearers to give some minutes at least every day. After instancing St. Augustine's and other conspicuous conversions, which resulted from hearing passages in the Word of God spoken, he proceeded: "St. Charles Borromeo says, 'The Bible ought to be the garden of the priest.' I say it ought to be the garden of the laity, too. What is good for us is good for you. God forbid we should go to heaven alone. We should be lonely there without you, shepherds without their flocks. We ought not to have a monopoly of religion, holiness, and goodness," &c. &c.

There was one expression in this sermon which struck me, as the Cardinal made use of it more than once, the words "spiritual profession" in contexts where "priestly office" was the almost obvious phrase and would certainly have been chosen by a Ritualistic curate, as in the sentence, "In season and out of season I am by the apostle bidden to exhort you by virtue of my spiritual profession." His life and teaching are a protest against sacerdotal pretension. On the morning of my last interview with the Cardinal, he had just returned from an Ordination, and he said to me, "I have been warning my young priests not to think that the putting on of a cassock means the putting off of one's humanity," just as in "Faith of our Fathers" he had written, "Should a priest consider himself greater than other men because he exercises such authority? Far from it; he ought to humble himself beneath others when he reflects to what weak hands are assigned such tremendous powers."

As the Cardinal has declared to the laity in the name of the priesthood that "It is our earnest wish that every word of the Gospel may be imprinted on your memory and on your heart," it would be a magnificent memorial of the Centenary of the American Hierarchy if the assembled Bishops would move the Holy See to permit them to supervise an American edition of the Bible to supersede the Douay translation. The English Authorised Version has become such an integral portion of English literature that the most powerful Church is handicapped among English-speaking people in not using its phraseology. There are a score or two of passages which would need emendation for doctrinal reasons, but the rest of the *Anglica versio* the Roman Catholic Church might appropriate with great advantage to herself without the surrender of a shred of doctrine. There are hundreds of verses of Holy Scripture and hundreds of Biblical names, which in our authorised form have passed into the everyday language and literature of the people—perhaps to a greater extent in America even than in England: most of the classical passages have precisely identical meanings in their equivalents in the Douay Bible, but in that version they are as uncouth and unfamiliar as are proper names like Achab, Assuerus, Aman, and Mardochai. The Catholic Church in America has adopted one detestable institution from the Protestant churches in England—the pew system, which is as inappropriate in a democratic country as it is inconsistent with the principle of the great Church of the people. Why not restore that Protestant institution to the sole use and enjoyment of American Protestants (for the English Church is discarding it), and take in exchange the noblest translation ever made in the days before translation was a lost art, which is in truth the common heritage of all English-speaking people?

An able writer, quoting Bishop Vaughan of Salford, has recently remarked upon the debt which the Church of Rome owes to the Irish, in whose brogue her services are recited all over the world. Undoubtedly the immigrant Irish have done a great propagandist work, but no graver mistake could be made than that of supposing that the Catholic Church in America is merely a branch of the Church in Ireland. Much misapprehension as to things American is caused by travellers forming their judgments from what they see in New York, which is emphatically not a microcosm of the United States for the reason that in no other city does the immigrant population remain unassimilated so long. Visitors sometimes leave New York with the idea that the Catholic Church in America is represented by Tammany Hall, on account of the prominence of that institution; but if they went down town to the neighbourhood of the Church of St. Antony of Padua, they might equally well imagine that the Church in America is exclusively Italian, and in another quarter they would find German priests serving German congregations. The unceasing flow of immigration makes New York the least American city of the United States; but throughout the Union the grandchildren of men born in Westmeath or in Westphalia are as thoroughly American as are the descendants of the ladies who "refused George Washington," who, from the number of their progeny, must have been more numerous than St. Ursula's virgins at Cologne. Of course, the Irish accent is heard at many a Catholic altar between Boston and Santa Barbara. The first church I entered in the United States was the Cathedral at San Francisco, where the preacher was a fair-haired young priest, with the face of an angel and a brogue which carried one from the Golden Gate to the Cove of Cork; but the vicar-general of the diocese, who is a member of the old Irish family of Prendergast, is as polished an American gentleman as is Archbishop Corrigan of New York, or Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia, both of whom bear Irish names, and neither of whom has any more brogue than has President Harrison, who is descended from the Puritan regicide.

Nor must it be imagined that the Catholics of America are in great preponderance Irish, even by descent. Opening at random the clergy list of the United States, I find at the commencement of the letter B the following names: Baak, Baart, Baasen, Babinski, Bachand, Bachmann, Backes, Badelon, Badilla, Baeumle, Baker—half the nationalities of Europe represented; Dutch, Flemish, Spanish, German, French, Polish, Hungarian, and English, but no Irish name. Of course, if the book had opened at letter O, we might have lighted on a very Irish column, interspersed with a few exceptions, like Oechtering, Oeinck, Offergeld, and Ogulin. The list is instructive as showing the cosmopolitan character both of the American nation and of the Catholic Church. The enumeration of the occupants of the see of New Orleans exemplifies this. French bishops might be looked for in the Creole episcopates of Louisiana, but the present Archbishop of New Orleans is a Dutchman, and his predecessors this century have included Spaniards and a Belgian, as well as Frenchmen.

It should be noted, however, that the nationality of a priest in the United States does not necessarily afford information as to the origin of his congregation, whether he be Irish, German, or of some less numerous race of settlers. The proportion of foreign priests to the Catholic laity is large, on account of the obvious difficulty in obtaining sufficient candidates for a profession which does not offer great pecuniary rewards in a country where material prosperity is the chief aim of life. Two hundred young seminarists singing Tenebræ in the choir of Baltimore Cathedral for this reason struck me as a most interesting spectacle to witness in America. The son of a peasant or of a humble tradesman in Connaught or in Flanders, by taking holy orders, secures high social promotion, and his modest clerical stipend is usually a large advance on the income he would have touched had he followed his father's calling. In the United States there is no peasantry, and the young postulants for the priesthood recruited from all ranks of life are each giving up the chance of acquiring wealth, which is the birthright of every United States citizen. All honour is due to that small section of the manhood of America, whether found among theological students or among professors and teachers at Harvard, Yale, and Johns Hopkins, which voluntarily abnegates a career held in the highest honour, because opulence is its goal, and dedicates itself to a life of relative poverty, for the sake of religion or of sound learning.

Philadelphia, unlike New York, is a typical American commercial city which illustrates the position and progress of the Roman Catholic Church in the Union. Although the estimable Society of Friends is not as relatively strong there as formerly, and though Pennsylvania was in the old days a favourable locality for Catholic settlers, yet the tradition of Philadelphia is decidedly Protestant. For all that, the "Quaker City" contains nearly as many Roman Catholics as the entire population of Rome. It contains more Catholics than the entire population of any other town in Catholic Italy but Naples; of any town in Catholic Spain but Madrid; of any town in Catholic Belgium but Brussels; and of any town in France except Paris and Lyons. Among the great Catholic cities of Europe whose inhabitants are less numerous than the Catholic population of Philadelphia are Milan, Turin, Palermo, Barcelona, Antwerp, Bordeaux, and Marseilles. Statements in this form are frequently made to illustrate the vastness of London, but Philadelphia is not even a London on a small scale. It is a characteristic American city of the first rank, larger than any single British municipality in the provinces, but not much larger than Manchester and Salford together with the adjoining townships, and it contains over 300,000 Catholics. The next census will probably show that this figure is considerably below the mark, as the diocese contains 400,000 Catholics, and there is no great centre of population within it outside Philadelphia.

When we find that the Roman Catholic Church can claim 10,000,000 United States citizens in a population of 60,000,000, it is difficult to over-estimate the influence which the expansion of the Church in America will have on the future of Christendom. Judging from her past progress and considering that the two races to which the majority of American Catholics belong are the two most prolific of the white races in the United States, it seems certain that she will increase her proportion with the growth of the population. But, calculating as if she will remain relatively stationary and reducing by one-third the estimated 600,000,000 which it is predicted that the United States will contain in a hundred years' time, the Roman Catholic Church will then claim nearly 70,000,000 English-speaking people in America alone. By that time Australasia, South Africa, and Canada will be thickly inhabited. Under what flag those vast regions of the earth will be governed, no one can foretell, but two things are certain—that the English language will be spoken throughout them, and that the Church of Rome will maintain the progress she has commenced this century among English-speaking peoples. If every French-speaking person in the world is counted as a devout Catholic, the number of French-speaking Catholics will long before that period be immeasurably below that of the English-speaking Catholics; and the same may be said regarding the Italian and Spanish languages.

Without waiting to realise the forecast that the English tongue is fated to be the chief language of the Roman Catholic Church, we may consider some of the effects already produced by the establishment of that religion among the English-speaking people of America. Not the least achievement of that great branch of the Church which is now celebrating the centenary of its hierarchy is that it has saved the Roman Catholic religion from the reproach often heard in Europe that its growth is only found associated with social retrogression and reaction. In France this feeling has relegated religion to the cult of women, children, and peasants, and in Ireland alone of European countries is the Church in sympathy with democratic progress.

Some Liberal critics may object that though Cardinal Gibbons may be thoroughly imbued with the democratic spirit it is not in harmony with the unchanging policy of Rome, which is hostile to liberty; that the Church may profess the most Liberal doctrine while she is in a minority, but that if she obtained ascendency we might witness an *auto da fé* in Madison Square. Cardinal Gibbons approaches the subject of religious persecution from the other extreme, and is so inspired with the charity which thinketh no evil that he protects the Protestant religions as well as the Catholic from the stigma of having countenanced persecution. In "Faith of our Fathers" he writes, "From my heart I abhor and denounce every species of persecution of which the Spanish Inquisition may have been guilty;" and again in reference to the Massacre of St. Bartholomew he says, "I have no words strong enough to express my detestation of that inhuman slaughter;" but in both instances he denies that the Church was responsible, just as in another passage referring to the proscriptive measures of Protestants against the Church of Rome he says, "I know full well that these acts of cruelty form no part of the creed of the Protestant Churches."

It is to be feared that more sceptical students of history cannot accept the Cardinal's view, and that the truth is that every Church has persecuted when it has had the power and the opportunity, so long as persecution was part of the economy of the religious and political life of the day. Even the Puritans who came to America to escape from the Anglicans who had in turn suffered at the hands of the Catholics did not leave the spirit of persecution behind in Europe, and it is well known how they put to death Quakers and burnt witches alive in their New England settlements. The most enlightened Prince who ever sat on the throne of England, who moreover secured the British constitution and the Protestant succession, consented to the torture and subsequent massacre of Cornelius de Witt for a political offence, just a hundred years after St. Bartholomew. It is absolutely futile to defend or to condemn the religious and political methods of the past by the milder standard of to-day. "Homo homini lupus" is probably as true now as it ever was, but we live in an age of anæsthetics.

The policy of the Church in Spain during the present century may perhaps be cited to show that the spirit of intolerance is not yet dead; but in answer to this it may be pointed out that in modern times churches and religious sects are often in matters of conduct strongly influenced by the atmosphere of the country in which they are placed. For example, a Scotch Presbyterian minister will denounce Sunday amusements as a deadly sin, while a Dutch predicant, holding precisely the same theological tenets, will after morning service spend his Sunday afternoon in the Bosch at the Hague listening to what his Scottish co-religionist would call godless music. Cardinal Gibbons again, in his forthcoming work "Our Christian Heritage," in a chapter on "The Religious Element in our American Civilisation," points with pride to the national observance of the Christian Sabbath, which his distinguished colleague in the Sacred College, Cardinal San Felice of Naples, would regard as merely local usage. The most remarkable instance, however, of public opinion moulding the policy of Christian churches used to be found in the United States, when throughout the eleven Slave States of the Union ministers of religion in their own pulpits and assembled in synods, presbyteries, and conferences, used to declare "that, as the Great Head of the Church has recognised the relation of master and slave, we conscientiously believe that slavery is not a sin against God." Slavery was abolished; public sentiment accepted the inevitable; and the clergy of the Southern States ceased to take their texts from the Epistle to Philemon.

Cardinal Gibbons's opportunism is not of this description. His denunciation of monopolies in his memorial to the Holy See is as courageous an act in the America of to-day as the denunciation of slavery would have been in the Southern States thirty years ago. The illustrations of the influence exercised by public opinion on religious policy were only given to show that though Spain under a certain *régime* might foster intolerance in the Church, a country like America could find no room for a religion of reactionary tendency, and the fact that the Catholic Church has taken root in that land and is flourishing is the best proof that in the United States she is abreast with the democratic movement and with liberal progress.

If France is the eldest daughter of the Church, America is destined to be her strongest and biggest child, and it will be interesting to watch this youngest daughter maintaining the position she has already secured in the intimate councils of the Church. If the elder branches were well advised they would look to America to provide the Church Universal with a ruler. All the best friends of the Papacy, outside the "Italian ring" which fences it round, are agreed that the time has come when it would be for the highest interest of the Church to break down the tradition of the last three centuries and a half which prescribes that the occupant of St. Peter's chair shall invariably be an Italian. We have seen how the Church has gained a stronger title than ever to its claim of universality, but the constitution of the Sacred College is Italian and not cosmopolitan. The full complement of that august body consists of seventy cardinals. The present number, since the recent death of Cardinal Schiaffino, is sixty-five. Ten of them are Austrian, German, Hungarian, and Polish; seven are French; five are British subjects (of whom one is French Canadian); four are Spanish; two Portuguese; one Belgian, and one American: thirty representing all the nationalities of the world, and thirty-five being Italians.

With this Italian preponderance, the other nationalities would have less ground of complaint if at the Vatican there were a corresponding council of state, in which the non-Italian Catholics were represented even in the inadequate proportion of thirty to thirty-five, but the intimate advisers of the Sovereign Pontiff are all Italians, who, with one or two exceptions, can neither read nor speak a word of English. For charm of manner, a polished Italian prelate is unrivalled, but his knowledge of the English-speaking world is that of a little child. The most accomplished Italian priest, even if he has been occasionally employed on a mission to a Catholic court, has no comprehension of constitutional government, still less is he capable of understanding the democratic movement of the age. The Vatican has a certain aptitude in dealing with "sovereigns and statesmen," to use Lord Beaconsfield's expression, but we have seen how Cardinal Gibbons reminded the Sacred Congregation, on the great authority of Cardinal Manning, that in the coming era the Church will have to treat, not with princes and parliaments, but with the masses of the people.

Although there is no immediate prospect of a vacancy in the Holy See, predictions are constantly being made as to the successor to Leo the Thirteenth. These journalistic prophecies are of no value whatever, excepting from the significant unanimity with which they make the coming Pontiff an Italian. Sometimes the Conservative Vicar-General of the Pope, Cardinal Parocchi, is designated. Sometimes it is the Liberal Archbishop of Naples or the Liberal Patriarch of Venice. Cardinal San Felice is famous for his courageous devotion to the sufferers during the cholera at Naples, when he accompanied King Humbert through the hospitals:—but I remember witnessing a more courageous act on the part of Cardinal Agostini at Venice, when he officiated at the christening by Queen Margherita of an ironclad with the significant name of "Galileo," in the official presence of Signor Crispi, who, on his recent appointment to the ministry of Signor Depretis, had been denounced by the clerical journals as an excommunicate. The election of either the Neapolitan or the Venetian Cardinal would doubtless ensure a *modus vivendi* between the Vatican and the Italian Government, but the Church needs a ruler whose wisdom and enlightenment is capable of dealing with farther-reaching questions than those which relate to the limits of the kingdom of Italy.

It would have been a happy choice for the Church, and one the importance of which it is impossible to exaggerate, if the Sacred College had in its wisdom selected as successor to Pius the Ninth the great Cardinal who is at the head of every religious and social movement in this country; but what the Church Universal would have gained, England would have lost. Cardinal Manning occupies a unique place in English history; there is no other instance of an individual exercising similar power and influence in this country, who has not been aided by legislative or official rank. It is probable that the Cardinal is content with his unprecedented position, yet it is strange in these days when much is talked about strengthening the Upper House by giving it a representative character, that no Prime Minister has ever seen fit to advise the offer of a place in it to the eminent Englishman who represents not only all the Catholic population of these islands, but the entire struggling populace of our cities, of every creed, and without a creed. A peerage would confer no dignity or even precedence on Cardinal Manning, as by the Queen's sign manual, he was, on the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, with the assent of the Heir to the Throne, and the present Prime Minister, who were members of it, assigned precedence immediately after the Royal Family. It is a long drop from the chair of St. Peter to a seat in the House of Lords, and there is a certain bathos in associating a modern coronet with the venerable head which might have worn most worthily the triple tiara.

Although Cardinal Manning would have been the most powerful pontiff since Hildebrand, every one who has the slightest knowledge of feeling on the continent is aware that an English Pope would be placed in a situation of peculiar difficulty on account of his nationality. Italy might object to a French Pope; Portugal might be jealous of a Spanish Pope; but the appointment of an Englishman to the Holy See would excite the animosity and the intrigue of every government on the continent.

The United States stand in a very different relation to the powers of Europe. All the continental nations have a friendly feeling for Americans — a sentiment which

Americans will retain as long as they steer clear of international complications into which Samoan and Cuban entanglements might draw them. It is to be feared that the friendliness of the continental powers for America is stimulated by the idea that America as a nation has not too much love for Great Britain. Monsignor Keane is said to have recently given at Nashville some reasons why an American should not be elevated to the Papacy. The Rector of the Catholic University at Washington is reported to have stated that "an American, no matter how learned and how well posted in European affairs, is thoroughly unfitted to fill the Papal See. The Pope must be a thorough cosmopolitan. He must be conversant with the political and spiritual conditions of France, Germany, and Spain. No American can grasp the situation in all its details. His educational surroundings and life are totally different from that of the man who is fitted to fill the Papacy." Now, it seems to me that the learned Bishop is too modest on behalf of his countrymen. A British traveller who has taken a superficial view of America might come back and declare that the only cosmopolitans to be found in the United States are the American maidens, whose knowledge of the world is undoubtedly as profound as it is amazing. The American politician is rarely a man of the world, but America takes no pride in her politicians; the American man of business frequently looks upon Wall Street as the centre of the universe; and the American man of fashion is a maladroit travesty of an Englishman. But the manhood of America does not wholly consist of such as these. The shrewd American nature is the best foundation for knowledge of the world as soon as it is removed from the narrow horizon of American life to which the Bishop refers. What more thorough cosmopolitans are to be found in any capital of Europe than certain diplomatic representatives of the United States? They have had no advantage of training; they are taken from the lawyer's desk or the professor's chair, yet they are able to hold their own with, and win the admiration of, the most accomplished products of our old European civilisation. It is the success of these men in adapting themselves to unfamiliar surroundings, and in forming confidential relations with statesmen and potentates often denied to *diplomates de la carrière*, which makes one believe that, from the worldly point of view, the highest position in Europe could be worthily filled by an American.

Of the ecclesiastical qualifications of Cardinal Gibbons for the most exalted honour in the Church's gift, it is not for a layman to speak. It is enough that the Holy See has seen fit to set him at the head of one of the most powerful and perhaps the most intelligent hierarchy in the world, and that the Vatican has paid unprecedented respect to his counsel. Of his fitness as a man of affairs and of his knowledge of the world I have had some opportunity of forming a judgment. During many months of travel and residence in the United States and Canada my observation led me to the conclusion that the North American continent has produced in this generation two really great men, in the sense that the last generation accounted Lincoln and Cavour as great. One of them we have the honour of reckoning as a fellow-subject of the Queen, Sir John Macdonald, the Prime Minister of our Canadian Dominion. The other, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, although twenty years his junior, is his equal in marvellous knowledge of men, and, although in some respects of singularly different nature, resembles him in the possession of that lofty opportunism which is the essential of all true statesmanship. Cardinal Gibbons combines the suavity of an Italian monsignore with that ingenuous integrity and robustness which we like to think is the characteristic of our Anglo-Saxon race. If he were called to occupy the most conspicuous and most ancient throne in Christendom he would not go to Europe as a novice in European affairs. To have assisted at an Œcumenical Council at an age when most men are on the threshold of a career is an early training in cosmopolitanism rarely experienced. During the intervening twenty years the Cardinal's frequent visits to Europe have brought him into contact with some of the acutest intellects of the Old World. Moreover, since his elevation twelve years ago to the head of the hierarchy of the United States he has governed an episcopate and a priesthood which are composed of members of every European nation. His unexampled undertaking two years ago, when, the youngest member of the Sacred College, he prevailed upon the Holy See to reconsider a momentous judgment, was not the achievement of a man whose attributes are merely local and national. The installation in the chair of St. Peter of this enlightened English-speaking Churchman would be an event of such import to human society that one dares not hope to see its accomplishment, for it seems as if it would be the first step towards bringing back to the Church the great democracies which are destined to govern the world, and as if it would hasten the time when "unum ovile fiet et unus pastor."

THE RESULTS OF THE EPISCOPAL CONVENTION.

From *The Christian Union*, New York, Oct. 31, 1889.

The attention which the triennial Synod of the Episcopal Church has received from the secular press during the last three weeks is out of all proportion to the amount of legislation which has been accomplished or the formal laws which have been enacted. Much was expected of the Convention by members of this Church, but a large proportion of the matters on which it was hoped that some action would be taken have been passed over until another session. The change of name, the reaching of a new basis of representation, the erection of a Court of Appeal, the passing of a canon on marriage and divorce, the appointment of suffragan bishops, the settlement of the hymnal question, the provincial system—all these issues have been deferred; and the feeling is very strong, apparently, among the Episcopal people, that action on these matters ought not to have been postponed. On the other hand, the Convention has clung with great tenacity and substantial success to the revision of the Prayer-Book, which it has completed, so far as its work could be final, with the expectation that a standard book can be reached in the Convention of 1892. The work of this session has been substantially confined to the revision of the Prayer-Book, and the spirit of the changes has been to reach greater simplicity and flexibility rather than to conform more closely to English usage and precedent. It was very evident that the clerical and lay deputies did not care to favor advanced doctrine, though they did not seem to wish to deny a rightful amount of liberty in that direction. What was very noticeable in the process of revision was that Ritualists and Broad Churchmen frequently voted for the same propositions. So far as a rough estimate can be made of the results reached by the present changes, the effect will be twofold; it will compel a stricter and more catholic observance in some directions, and will allow a greater flexibility or latitude in others. It is believed that no important doctrines have been touched, and the wonder is that, in voting on the revision step by step in the popular house, the result has been generally wise and conservative, and without special party bias. No one school of thought has had its way, but the result is such as to improve the Prayer-Book without injuring it. All religious bodies have an interest in these changes, because in the general advance toward liturgical worship the Episcopal Church takes the lead. The Convention will be known as the one that carried liturgical revision through to practical results; but this was not the only work of legislation. The canon on deaconesses is a wise recognition of the services of Christian women; the appointments for missionary bishops were wise and judicious; and the dioceses admitted into union with the Convention, and the new missionary jurisdiction set off from Nebraska and called the Platte, indicate the advance in religious work. But all this does not present a large result for three weeks of deliberative work.

If the Episcopal Convention is to be rightly interpreted, it must be judged, not by the amount of its legislation, but in the same light in which the recent Congregational Council is regarded. It is in some sense a clearing-house. During its recess questions arise which need discussion, and often demand legislation. A Church Congress may discuss them, but it acts upon an ecclesiastical body only so far as it shapes public opinion; the Convention discussed questions with a view to legislation, and in the presentation of different sides of it in free debate it is often the case that no further discussion is required. It is for this reason that much of the action in the Episcopal Convention was disappointing to those who watch it from the outside. It seemed again and again to be reaching an important result, when, through the non-concurrence of one house with the other, a check was interposed and no result was possible. It is for this reason that many things which Churchmen evidently hoped might receive treatment in the Convention were laid on the table or passed by. Then it has been apparent that legislation was often avoided because it might conflict with the provincial system, which the Convention dodged, but which thoughtful men in the Episcopal Church regard as inevitable, if not near at hand. The entire session in New York had this attitude of delay with reference to every important question brought before it except the revision of the Prayer-Book. It was evidently the desire to give the largest possible consideration to important changes before finally acting upon them. There was the further impression that the Episcopal Church is at this time in a transitional position. It is passing out of a restrained and cramped life into one of large freedom and multiform activity. This was evident in the order of the debates as well as in the attitude of the debaters. The party lines were all broken up. Men spoke and voted, not as party men, but on their conviction of what was best. This was never known to the same extent before, and it indicates that the conservatism of this Church is yielding to a desire to place it in the heart of the movements which to-day control American religious life. We have noted with satisfaction that Churchmen are increasingly free from ' bumptiousness," that they are less and less given to boasting about Episcopacy, less confident of their isolated mission, more and more desirous of working in the common lines of religious thought and life. This was not said in so many words, but it cropped out a hundred times as the animating spirit of the Bishops and of the House of Deputies. To us this was the best result of the whole Convention. It showed that the Episcopal Church is less careful to maintain its traditions than to establish a reputation for good and effective work among American Christians. The strong points of this Communion are evident to everybody, but what we wish to see in it, and what has been the special distinction of its recent Convention, is that its strength has been applied to the putting of its house in order so that it can be a better working Church than ever before. This, in a word, has been the prevailing note of the New York session, and in emphasizing this note the Episcopal Church has increased its friends among all evangelical Christians.

THE AMERICAN BOARD.

REPORTED BY " MANHATTAN."

From *Zion's Herald* (Methodist), Boston, Oct. 23, 1889.

On Wednesday afternoon, Oct. 16, at 3 o'clock, Dr. Storrs, the honored president of the " A. B. C. F. M.," stood upon the platform in the Broadway Tabernacle, and in the presence of a vast congregation called to order the American Board of Foreign Missions. It is nearly sixty years since the Board met in this city, and as questions of the gravest import were to come up for discussion, great interest was aroused not only in New York, but in " the regions beyond." And so the great church was filled in every part and from first to last the proceedings were followed with the deepest attention. Broadway Tabernacle is too well known to require description. Standing on the corner of 34th street and Broadway, in the centre of business life and energy, surrounded by stores of all descriptions, with the trains of the Elevated Railroad rushing by every few minutes, horse-cars passing up and down in never-ending streams, wagons, trucks, and carriages of all descriptions adding to the general tumult, one would imagine that in a place like this the spirits of gain and greed and avarice would make impossible calm and holy worship. But William M. Taylor is pastor of this church ! And under his inspiring leadership this church is thronged morning and evening every Sabbath throughout the year. When a man has anything to say, people usually want to hear it ; and Dr. Taylor has a good deal to say, and what he says is worth hearing.

As a proof of this, read, if you get a chance, his address of welcome to the Board. It was a hearty handshake in words. It was words made flesh. It was phrased in English, accented in Scotch, and American in grip and earnestness. Of course Dr. Storrs made a graceful and eloquent reply. Anything else would be impossible with Dr. Storrs. He is always graceful and always eloquent. And what a president he makes ! Keen, quick, shrewd, with a commanding presence, and a voice wondrously distinct, he kept the meeting under the most perfect control.

After this delightful exchange of courtesies, the Board listened to reports from the prudential committee, presented by Secretary Alden and Treasurer Ward. The total receipts for the year were something over $680,000, and the expenditures not far from the same amount.

At the evening session there was an immense congregation. The church was thronged to the doors, and to hear that multitude sing was worth a journey across the city. We used to think that Methodist congregations had a monopoly in the way of singing, but any one who attends a meeting of the American Board, will have that illusion dispelled. And possibly other illusions as well. But the singing at these meetings has been hearty, vigorous, tuneful, and in volume almost equals that of Spurgeon's congregation in London.

Dr. L. Pratt, of Norwich, Conn., was the preacher for the evening. And he did preach. " As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you," was the text, and the obligation resting upon the Christian Church was presented with a force, a vividness, an intensity, which all who heard could not but realize. " The missionary spirit is not a phase of Christianity, it is Christianity," is a sample sentence of this most suggestive and appropriate discourse.

On Wednesday morning, Dr. Alden presented a very valuable paper on "The Place Occupied in Missionary Work by Prayer," after which there were devotional services of half an hour led by Dr. A. H. Plumb, of Boston. The American Board may be divided on questions both of doctrine and polity, and it may discuss these questions with much heat and vigor, but its discussions never break in upon its devotions, and all through there is a most intense religious feeling. Diligence in business and fervency of spirit unite most happily in these gatherings, and to break up the routine of "Whereas," and "Resolved," and "Mr. President," with thirty minutes of song and prayer and testimony, is "as rivers of water in a dry place."

At this session Secretary Smith read a most remarkable paper on "Africa." A more comprehensive, statesmanlike document it would hardly be possible to imagine. The needs, conditions and claims of the Dark Continent were sketched in a masterly way.

Secretary Clark, through illness, was not able to be present, and so Dr. F. E. Clark read the secretary's paper on "Japan." This paper was very interesting, and when we remember that Japan has only been opened to missionary effort for seventeen years, and that now our Congregational friends have there forty-three self-supporting churches out of a total of forty-nine, with eight thousand converts as seals of their ministry, we can readily see how God has favored them in the land of the Mikado.

At the afternoon session a special committee was to report, and as the air was somewhat electrical, a storm was feared. Dr. Behrends, of Brooklyn, presented this report, which was to the effect that a large number of circulars had been sent out to pastors, corporate members of the Board, and professors in theological seminaries, asking what change, if any, was desired in the method of electing corporate members. The replies had not been as numerous or as definite as the committee had reason to expect, and hence they were not prepared to suggest any substantial change. It looked for a few moments as though the report of the committee would be accepted without any discussion, and the matter be disposed of for the present; but Dr. Patton, of Washington, in a very mild, gentle way, made a "few remarks," and the great question of the hour was made prominent. The subject of representation, of tests, of men who have been accepted by the churches and yet rejected by the Prudential Committee, was now before the meeting; and to get rid of it without angry debate, seemed almost impossible. Dr. Griffis, of Boston, was the next speaker. He declared in the plainest terms that many of the Congregational ministers of Boston and vicinity would not be accepted as missionaries by the Prudential Committee, owing to doctrinal differences, and that the Prudential Committee was very like a secret tribunal before which the would-be missionary must appear. Dr. Griffis spoke with much force and earnestness, and evidently was heard favorably by a large proportion of the audience, if we may judge by the applause which his words called forth. But as the audience on the main floor and galleries had no business to interfere any more than spectators in a court-room, the president very properly rebuked any attempt at applause. After Mr. Ely, of New York, a corporate member, had spoken, pleading for some change in the system, Dr. R. R. Meredith, of Brooklyn, made a most earnest and vigorous speech. *En passant*, what a magnificent speaker Mr. Meredith is! His voice is wonderfully rich, not only in strength, but in tone, and he possesses that strange quality which for lack of a better word we call magnetism. But the "Liberals" had it all their own way, for from the "Conservatives" "not a drum was heard, not a funeral note." Still the committee was continued, which was the objective point of the debate.

At this stage a communication was read from the managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Chaplain McCabe, Dr. Baldwin, and Gen. Fisk were introduced by the chairman and made brief addresses. These addresses were apt, bright, and telling. All three speakers were at their best, and you know what that means.

In the evening the crowd was so great to hear addresses by returned missionaries and others, that an overflow meeting was held in the Presbyterian church on W. 34th Street, and this service, as well as the one in the Tabernacle, was of special interest.

On Thursday morning the report of the committee on "Africa" was presented by Dr. G. S. Walker, of Hartford, Conn., after which two most valuable and interesting addresses were given by Rev. E. H. Richards and Rev. J. Tyler, both missionaries in Africa. The committee on programme are to be congratulated on their arrangements in this particular. They not only present most admirable reports from each special field, but they introduce missionaries from that field, and thus diffuse the most profitable information, and also create the greatest possible interest. Our Congregational friends do not run much to "speechifying," or enthusiasm as some regard it, but they believe in giving the fullest light concerning the work that is being done, and in this way receive intelligent contributions from a willing people. And this is much the better way. In many instances enthusiasm is but another name for gas. Red-hot speeches are very often red-hot nonsense. Money raised by mere excitement is seldom a free-will offering. The first thing that God did for this world was to make light, and the more light people have, the more money they will give.

Prof. Fisk, of Chicago, read the report of the committee appointed to consider the work of the Prudential Committee, and then another debate of a very interesting and suggestive character took place. Possibly all of the readers of *Zion's Herald* are not aware that the Prudential Committee is appointed by the corporate members of the Board, and as these corporate members are not elected by the churches, nor in any wise amenable to the Congregational Council, but are a self-perpetuating body, the entire power of the American Board is vested in them. So far this body has been eminently conservative, and looks with disfavor upon the "new theology" idea of which we have heard so much within the last few years. As the Prudential Committee virtually control everything, the corporate members have been careful to see that the majority represented, both in doctrine and polity, the most conservative elements. And so a man who might be accounted worthy to preach the Gospel in Boston, would not be allowed to preach it in Bombay. The savages of New York and Chicago might have for a minister one who had misgivings concerning certain disputed points, but the same man must not go to Zululand or Tokio. The heterodox brother could remain at home, assume the pastorate of a great church, raise all the money possible for the American Board, and thus send the orthodox brother abroad to do work among the distant heathen. It would be going too far to say that this was a case of "a house divided against itself," but truth compels the remark that the "big brothers" of this house differed very widely on some important matters.

After one or two others had spoken on the report presented by Prof. Fisk, Dr. McKenzie, of Cambridge, made a strong speech. It was not loud, or passionate, or bitter, but it was calm, judicious, and effective. Such a speech at such a critical time was of the greatest moment, and to the final result Dr. McKenzie made a great contribution.

Rev. H. W. Warren, of Cincinnati, was the first member of the committee to make any definite reply to the many speeches already delivered, and his reply was earnest and manly. His reference to the "City of New York" standing within a few miles of port after a splendid voyage across the Atlantic was most apt and telling. Several others spoke, but the report was not recommitted by a vote of 23 to 54.

The report of the committee on "Japan" was read by Prof. Fisher, which was followed by able speeches by Prof. Tucker, of Andover, and Dr. Griffis, of Boston. After the noon recess the Lord's Supper was celebrated, and the occasion was one of deep spiritual feeling. Then came a report on "Turkey," read by Joseph Cook, of Boston. Mr. Cook is evidently of the orthodox wing, if his report and address may be taken in proof.

After the election of a score or more of corporate members, two reports were presented by the nominating committee, the one dropping Rev. C. A. Dickinson from the Prudential Committee, the other dropping Dr. Alden from the office of home secretary. These reports brought things to a head. The rumors and unrest of the past days at once took form, and for a little while serious trouble was feared. When two or three had spoken in opposition to the majority report, Lyman Abbott, of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, made an earnest plea for harmony, to which Dr. Noble replied, and the discussion at this point was a little warm and slightly personal. Dr. Behrends, Dr. Meredith, Dr. Taylor, Washington Gladden and others took part in the discussion, but thanks to the strength and manliness of Dr. Storrs, a happy and peaceful solution of the problem was secured. Both men were retained : Mr. Dickinson was kept on the committee, and Dr. Alden was appointed home secretary. A committee of nine was appointed to inquire into the methods of administration at Boston, and to recommend any changes that may seem needful, and after some routine business this most exciting and eventful session closed.

At the evening session Dr. Storrs, the re-elected president, delivered a most brilliant and powerful oration. Though possibly just a little weary after the excitement of the afternoon, yet in the presence of that vast audience he forgot all about fatigue, and surpassed even himself. Few men in this country, or any other, could have given such an address. It was profound, scholarly, comprehensive, and yet it was attractive, interesting, powerful. He spoke of the purpose of this meeting, the great object which controlled the American Board, and of the inevitable success which lay before them. He dropped a sentence which may be as potent as Robert Hall's "liquid fire and distilled damnation," when he hoped that the money which liquor-dealers received from the sales of their foul drinks in heathen lands, "might be as hot in their hands as the asphalt which covered the depths of hell." At this session Gen. Howard offered prayer, and to hear that immense audience unite with him in repeating the Lord's Prayer was most thrilling.

On Friday morning the Board met for its final session. This, perhaps, was one of the most interesting and valuable of any of the meetings held. Addresses were made by some returning missionaries and also by some young men just under appointment. There was something not only heroic, but pathetic, in the spectacle of several bright, highly-cultured young men, standing in the presence of that vast audience, and for the last time for many years looking upon the faces of Christian friends, and then going to distant lands to toil for the Master whom they love. The age of chivalry is not gone. Leonidas and Peter the Hermit have their successors. The martyr spirit of Nero's time and of the Middle Ages is still in the church. It is comparatively easy to die for Christ, but to live for Him in the midst of degradation and heathendom is a much greater test of love and sarcifice. These young men made no boast or parade of their devotion. One of them thrilled the audience with the statement that on the morning when he received word that the Board had accepted him and he was under appointment to Africa, "he was more happy than a bridegroom on the morning of his marriage day." Men like this are not "of such stuff as dreams are made of." No dream ever made an African missionary. Nothing but God's love as a fulcrum, and Christ's cross as a lever, could raise men to this sublime height of loyalty and devotion.

Bishop Hurst was present at this service, and made a brief but thoughtful and appreciative address. Prayer was offered for the missions and the missionaries, after which votes of thanks were passed, and the Board adjourned to meet in Minneapolis one year from date. Then a most fervent and touching prayer was offered by Dr. Taylor, and Dr. Storrs pronounced the benediction, and this eventful but highly profitable and successful meeting was dismissed.

THE STRUGGLE IN THE AMERICAN BOARD.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Oct. 26, 1889.

The New York meeting of the American Board will be regarded as one of the most notable in its history and in the annals of the Congregationalist body which it represents. The division of opinion concerning future probation with which the troubles of the last half-dozen years began widened into something more permanent than a theological controversy. It came to be a question of denominational policy; it was whether the American Board, which has always been managed as a close corporation, should take into its service as missionaries men who represented the broader type of thought and belief which is growing in favor among all Protestant denominations; and the organization of this body was such that it could be controlled in the interest of the conservative opinions. At Portland, at Boston, at Des Moines, at Springfield, and at Cleveland, a majority of votes could be had in favor of the traditional policy of the board and of a form of theology that was in vogue when the organization was begun in 1810. Meanwhile, what has been called "the new departure" had been spreading from parish to parish, and the reason of the one-sided policy of the Prudential Committee of the Board had been discussed in every Congregational parish in the country, and a large proportion of the wealthier laity had become unwilling to contribute liberally to missions. The extent of this defection was manifest in the steady decline of contributions, and it was supported by the unwillingness of men in the New England seminaries to enter the foreign field.

This was the situation when the American Board met in this city to hold its eightieth session. Dr. Storrs had accepted the presidency two years ago in the service of peace, but had not been able to secure it because the disposition among the managers of the board had been not to recognize the liberal men in its direction, and as the conservatives were to the liberals as two to one, this did not seem to be necessary. The meeting just concluded began entirely under the control of its historical representatives, and up to the last hours of the next to the last day of its session there was no yielding on any point to the wishes of the liberal men. An empty treasury and young men of ability alienated from the missionary field seemed to carry no weight with them, and evidently President Storrs felt with the other conservative men that the situation could not be changed. But the race is not always with the swift nor the battle with the strong. All along there had been a pathetic undercurrent that represented the piety and earnestness of the denomination, and the pleading of the men in the pastorate for peace, for toleration of divergent opinions, for a unity in essentials that compromised nothing vital, and for talking out needless differences till they were composed, and as the end of the session drew near the pleading grew so earnest and so irresistible that the whole board was lifted up to a higher plane, on which for the moment all their differences seemed to disappear. It was then that Dr. Storrs rose to the occasion and spoke not for party but for the comprehension of honest differences of opinion within one working organization and for a broader platform on which all could stand in the service of a common cause. Those who witnessed that scene in the Broadway Tabernacle when brother looked brother in the face and the flush of anger passed into the joy of the spirit of love, and when Dr. Storrs visibly stood amid the divided host and commanded them to act as brethren, will never forget it. It was as if conditions were changed by an invisible hand, and the American Board had been delivered into the custody of the parishes as their representative.

The meaning of the culmination of this struggle is that, though the conflict is not over, steps have already been taken by which the existing differences will be adjusted and a reasonable divergence of opinion will be allowed on both sides while brethren work together in unity. The committee of nine just and reasonable men representing true peace-makers now appointed will have the moral support of that memorable meeting to give character to their action and the restoration of harmony in the American Board and in the congregational parishes is only a question of time. Churchmen have breathed more freely since our memorable contrast with the same end in view reached a culmination in 1874, and to-day the Congregationalist body is to be congratulated on reaching the point when it can move more freely toward the constructive unity in a simpler religious belief and in the marking out to better working methods than it has been possible for it to move as a whole heretofore.

REVISION OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

From *The Christian Standard* (Disciple), Cincinnati, Oct. 12, 1889.

The discussion of the revision of the Presbyterian standards is becoming quite pronounced and stirring, and the signs are that the heat of the battle is not yet reached. We propose now and again to notice what is being said by leading Presbyterians on the different sides of the issue, for it is many-sided. Some desire no change whatever; some advocate a few slight changes in what is judged to be unfortunate phraseology, but are opposed to any change in the substance of the doctrine; while still others would be pleased to see its Calvinism supplanted by semi-Arminianism. The chief point of attack has been the chapter that deals with the doctrine of "God's Eternal Decrees." In opposition to all clamors for change Prof. W. G. T. Shedd, D.D., LL.D., in the New York *Evangelist*, stands for the Confession as it was at the beginning. He claims that a creed that was adopted by Charles Hodge and Albert Barnes is sufficiently broad to include all who are really Calvinistic and Presbyterian in belief. He seems to forget, for the moment, that Albert Barnes contradicted the doctrine of the Confession on certain vital issues in one of his books, and found it necessary, in order to retain his standing, to consent to the expunging of what he had written, and what he continued to believe until his death. Prof. Shedd is right when he says:

> The doctrine of the divine decrees is the particular one selected by the Presbytery whose request has brought the subject of revision before the General Assembly. But the doctrine runs entirely through the Westminster documents, so that if changes were made merely in Chapter III. of the Confession, this chapter would be wholly out of harmony with the remainder. Effectual calling, regeneration, perseverance of the saints, are all linked in with the divine decree. The most cursory perusal will show that a revision of the Confession on this subject would amount to an entire recasting of the creed.

This is the exact truth in the case. Unless the Calvinism of the creed is extracted, it is not worth while to make any changes. Extract the Calvinism, and it will not be worth while to save what is left. A new creed on an Arminian basis will then be in demand; or, better still, the New Testament itself may find favor as an all-sufficient standard of faith and life.

Dr. Shedd's defence of the Calvinism of the Confession will be certain to have an effect exactly opposite to that which he desired. Calvinism so frankly and nakedly expressed will not do in this age of the world's progress. He says:

> Take an illustration. An able minister and divine, whose Calvinism is unimpeachable, suggests that Confession iii. 3, shall read: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained [for their sins] to everlasting death." If the clause in brackets is inserted without further explanation, the article might fairly and naturally be understood to teach that the reason why God passes by a sinner in the bestowment of regenerating grace is the sinner's sin. But St. Paul expressly says that the sinner's sin is not the cause of his non-election to regeneration. "The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, it was said, the elder shall serve the younger. Esau have I hated" (Rom. ix. 11, 13). The reason for the difference between the elect and non-elect is not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure. "He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. ix. 18). An explanation like this, without further explanation such as the proposer would undoubtedly make, would not only contradict Scripture, but change the Calvinistic doctrine into the Arminian. The reason for non-election would no longer be secret and sovereign, but known and conditional.

Dr. Shedd understands the Confession correctly on this subject. The writer who proposed to make the Confession say that "some men and angels are foreordained unto everlasting death" *for their sins*, was seeking to insert the Arminian doctrine of election into a Calvinistic creed—perhaps without knowing it. "For their sins" makes the reprobation conditional. Prof. Shedd gives the unconditional doctrine correctly when he says above, "The reason for the difference between the elect and the non-elect *is not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure.*" "This doctrine runs entirely through the Westminster documents," as Prof. Shedd declares, and it is useless to patch this old garment with the new cloth of conditional election.

But is it not a terrible doctrine, that of unconditional reprobation? Think of it: God did not foreordain men to everlasting death "*for their sins,*" but on account of his "sovereign good pleasure!" Though in the end he will actually deliver sinners unto everlasting death *for their sins*. Why this difference? Why determine to do it for one reason, and in the end actually accomplish it for another? Why is such an awful end *un*conditional in purpose and conditional in execution? This will never do. Such an unconditional decree will utterly break down in the judgment when all men, good and bad, will be disposed of according to what they have done. An *un*conditional salvation and reprobation in *purpose*, in a past eternity, can never be made to harmonize with a conditional salvation and reprobation, in *reality*, in a coming eternity. One or the other will break down. It will be the first. God *purposed* to save and condemn men as he actually saves and condemns—that is, conditionally. He conditions salvation on our faithfulness to his word, and condemns on account of our unfaithfulness. He is a bold theologian who will declare that God elected and reprobated men, whom he pleased, without any reference to these conditions, or who will say, as does Dr. Shedd, that "the reason for the difference between the elect and the non-elect is not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure?" Yet this is Calvinism pure and simple.

TOM PAINE'S BIBLE.

BY REV. JOHN G. HALL, D.D.

From *The Illustrated Christian Weekly*, New York, Oct. 12, 1889.

THAT Tom Paine had a Bible, is certain. That he knew what was in it, is what he himself largely makes known. And that he did not always read it to carp and cavil, but rather often to indorse and quote it is what anyone may see who examines his famous Revolutionary writings. In 1792 the "Websters," of Albany, then among the leading book publishers of the land, issued by subscription a volume of these writings, embracing "Common Sense," "Public Good," "The Rights of Man," etc., which was largely patronized by prominent persons throughout the States, such as Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts; James Madison, of Virginia; DeWitt Clinton, of New York; Rev. Samuel Kirkland, the famous missionary to the Oneidas, and very many others of similar social and religious standing.

The design of "Common Sense," first printed in 1776, was to justify to the world the step that the American colonies had taken for their Independence, and to brace up the colonists themselves to the great project they had in hand. And to accomplish those ends he manifestly resorted to the most cogent and unanswerable arguments within his reach, and which, as we perceive, he gathered profusely from the Bible. In depreciating a kingly form of government, he finely says: "Government by kings was first introduced to the world by the heathens, from whom the children of Israel copied the custom. . . . As the exalting one man so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature, so neither can it be defended on the authority of Scripture, for the will of the Almighty as declared by Gideon, and the prophet Samuel, expressly disapproves of government by kings. *Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's,* is no support of monarchical government, for the Jews at that time were without a king, and in a state of vassalage to the Romans."

And from this point, he goes into an extensive rehearsal of the Jewish history, in its pioneer Republican period, and in its subsequent ones of monarchical rule, showing how God favored the former, and vainly tried to dissuade his people from the latter. And he seems especially to aim to have God's name and sayings arrest the eye of the reader, by putting them frequently in double capitals ; as in Gideon's answer : "I will not rule you, neither shall my son rule over you, THE LORD SHALL RULE OVER YOU." And from the recorded debate and expostulation of Samuel with the people he quotes whole pages and does not spare double capitals, as in the following : "The thing displeased Samuel when they said, 'Give us a king to judge us ;' and Samuel prayed to the Lord, and the Lord said unto Samuel, 'Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee, for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me THAT I SHOULD NOT RULE OVER THEM.'"

And from this ancient instance of the Jews, which he plants as the chief fulcrum of his logical lever, he goes on to oppose monarchy in all its pretences to a Divine authority or warrant. And the manifest honesty, sincerity, and zeal with which he so deals, is very striking and impressive ; so that a modern reader may be inclined to rub his eyes and say, "Is this Tom Paine that I am reading ?" Yes, we answer ; it is Tom Paine bending himself down, in his earlier and less intemperate days, before his Bible ; the book that he there exalts to the highest dignity, and quotes with great freedom and effect.

Take the following from one of his numbers of "The Crisis" : "The natural right of the continent to be independent, is a point that never yet was called in question. It will not even admit of a debate. To deny such a right would be a kind of atheism against nature ; and the best answer to such an objection would be, '*The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.*'"

In one of his scathing letters to Lord Howe, he curiously writes : "Not many days ago, I accidentally fell in company with a person of this city (Philadelphia), noted for espousing your cause, and on my remarking to him that it appeared clear to me, by the late providential turn of affairs, that GOD Almighty was on our side, he replied, 'We care nothing for that,' etc." And to the same conscientious British General, he again says : "The poor reflection of having served your king, will yield you no consolation in your dying moments. He will crumble to the same undistinguishable ashes with yourself, and have sins enough of his own to answer for. You may, perhaps, be willing to be serious, but the destruction of the goods of Providence, this havoc of the human race, this sowing the world with mischief, must be accounted for to Him who made and governs it." Bravo ! Tom Paine. You had not read your Bible for naught.

And then further on, he says : "I have as little superstition in me as any man living, but my secret opinion has ever been, and still is, that God Almighty will not give up a people to military destruction, or leave them unsupportedly to perish, who had so earnestly and so repeatedly sought to avoid the calamities of war, by every decent method that wisdom could invent. Neither have I so much of the infidel in me as to suppose that HE has relinquished the government of the world and given us up to the care of devils."

Here, also, his Bible comes up to the surface. And probably there was no time in his subsequent pitiful career when he could keep all thoughts of the Holy Book out of his mind and memory ; and especially when those days came on, in which, as he himself says to Lord Howe, "Life began to wear a clouded look," and when he knew that his worn-out body was near to "crumble to the same undistinguished dust," with all lords and monarchs whose souls had fled to their last account. Poor man ! Had he followed his Bible as closely in morals as he did in politics, he would have reached a more honorable earthly end, and doubtless also a happier lot in the world beyond.

JOHN CHINAMAN.

BY REV. DANIEL MARCH, D.D.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Oct. 31, 1889.

JOHN CHINAMAN is the greatest mystery in our common humanity. Judged after Western ways of thinking, he is a great contradiction. He is versatile, ingenious, irrepressible, and yet he is the slave of tradition; he gets little advantage from his ingenuity, and he plods on in the same beaten track for ages. He transgresses the prime laws of health and longevity, and yet he works hard; he is almost insensible to pain, and he lives long. He sleeps in close rooms, he breathes bad air, makes a block of wood his pillow, and the dusty floor or the damp ground his bed. And yet he is more healthy than many who take the utmost pains to get fresh air and clean lodgings and comfortable beds. He carries burdens heavy enough to crush ordinary men, and yet he grows strong from the overtasking of his strength, and he never complains of the hard tasks put upon him. He eats all manner of unpalatable and indigestible food, and yet he thrives on his hard living, and his stomach seldom gives way under the pressure put upon it. He works all day in the paddy field up to his knees in mud and water; and the sign in his language which is the symbol of happiness is a mouthful of rice. When he would salute his friend with the blessing of peace in the morning, he asks if he has eaten his rice to-day. He smokes opium and tobacco, and he practices vices which cannot be named in delicate speech, and yet he has the most vitality of all the peoples of the East. He pulls out his beard with tweezers, shaves the front and back of his head with razors, and lets the hair on his crown grow as long as it will of itself, and then he splices it out with false hair to make it longer. He exposes his bare head and beardless face to the fierce rays of the sun, and yet I never heard of a Chinaman's getting a sunstroke. He works on ships, boats, and steamers, he runs on errands, draws the *jinricksha,* drives dog-carts and carriages, pushes wheelbarrows and tow-lines, and employers say he is just the man for the job when there is hard work to be done.

Sometimes he seems so dull that impatient people cannot get along with him, and yet he is so useful that nobody can do without him. He has a great reputation for lying and stealing in his own country, and just as great a reputation for honesty and truth-speaking in Java and Japan. He packs close on the cooly ship for the long voyage to Australia and the islands of the South Seas, he has no exercise on shipboard, he keeps under decks, he eats the coarsest food, and he comes out well and cheerful at the end of the voyage. He builds railroads and highways and canals, he works farms and mines and machines until he makes the owners rich, and then he is told he is not wanted any longer; he must go, and give place to men who do less work and demand more pay. He wears his blue cotton in all climates, and he faces all extremes of heat and cold without whiskey to keep him warm and without ice water to keep him cool. He gets rich when others starve, he keeps healthy when others die, he is quiet and cheerful when others are mourning and complaining, he is peaceful when others quarrel, he is industrious when others are idle and lazy, he flies kites and fights crickets like rude boys, and he cools himself with a fan as if he were the most effeminate of all people. And yet he endures more hardship, and suffers more abuse, than any other people on the face of the earth, unless the African be an exception. He is kicked and cuffed and snubbed by blustering John Bull and bragging Brother Jonathan, he is ridiculed and laughed at by all Western nations; and yet he comes up smiling from every fall, and he makes money out of the people who abuse and banish him.

The Chinaman's country is overcrowded with people. He thinks it the fairest and the most favored of all the lands of the earth, the only land worth living in, the only dust fit to be buried in, and yet he emigrates to all quarters of the globe; he appears to be contented wherever he is, and homesickness is a disease of which Chinamen never die. He mounts on the wrong side of his horse, and yet he rides well when he gets into the saddle; he makes the compass point the wrong way, and yet his junk seldom gets lost on the sea. He begins at the wrong end of his book to read, and he reads backwards, and yet he has been printing and reading books in his own language longer than any other people in the world.

According to our theories and ways of judging, the Chinaman is a great contradiction. He lives and thrives and multiplies, when he ought to fade and waste away and die. His tools are clumsy, his methods of working are awkward and ill adapted to what he tries to do, his taste is unrefined and unnatural. And yet in his line he makes the best work, and he underbids all manufacturers in the market of the world, while securing a good profit to himself. He pays divine honors to his deceased parents; he worships the god of money, and yet he has little pity for the suffering and the needy; he is cruel and brutal in his punishments; he murders his own children to relieve himself of the burden of supporting them. He paints landscapes without perspective, carves images of animals that never existed, incurs vast expense in support of a religion that has no God. He celebrates his father's birthday by presenting him with a coffin, and he burns paper money to pay the expense of his deceased mother in her journey to the country from which none ever return. The Chinaman, go where he will, contented as he seems to be everywhere, is really never at home save in his own country ; he never becomes a citizen or a subject of any other government than his own. He has no sympathies with the great philosophies, inventions and progressive ideas of our country and our day. He lives on, a relic of the past, a moving and breathing mummy of far distant generations, as if to tell the nineteenth century how the great nations of the ancient world would look if seen in "the fierce light which beats upon the thrones" and the peoples of the West.

The Chinese stand before the world, in this enlightened and progressive age, to tell us what would have been the condition of the most cultivated nations to-day, had it not been for the birth of the divine Child that was born in Bethlehem eighteen centuries ago. When students in cloistered halls, and theorists in schools of philosophy, get weary of culture and dissatisfied with Christian civilization, and write books and essays to show that life is not worth living in the West, let them go to the far East and see what life they have been lifted out of by the culture of which they are weary and the civilization with which they are not satisfied.

REVISION.

BY REV. JAMES M'COSH, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Herald and Presbyter*, Cincinnati, Oct. 9, 1889.

EVER since I became a teacher of the science of mind I have given more attention to philosophy than theology. In doing this, I have been able to serve religion more effectively than by any other course which I could take. My philosophy is realistic, being an exposition of the facts of our nature, and, being so, it must be favorable to the Scriptures, which reveal to us what we are as no other work has done. But I have been watching all along the signs of the times, and feel it to be honest to make known my views in every crisis of opinion in the Church. Hitherto I have not favored a revision of our Standards, but the time has come when we must face the question which is now being put in the Presbyterian churches all over the world. I know there is some risk in stirring up the inquiry, but there is more danger in trying to ignore or suppress it—which, in fact, cannot now be done. Our students, our young men generally, and our laity, are raising the question, and it is the plain duty of the Church to face it boldly and to guide the movement in the right direction. There are some passages in the Confession of Faith and in the Larger Catechism of which it may be doubted whether they are founded on the word of God, and which are offensive in their expression. Further, there is a want of a clear and prominent utterance, such as we have in the Scriptures, of the love of God, as shown in the redemption of Christ, which is sufficient for all men, and in the free and honest offer of salvation to all men, non-elect as well as elect. For the last thirty-nine years of my life my intercourse has been chiefly with young men, who are apt to open their hearts to me as knowing that I sympathize with them. Most of our young men have not paid much attention to the Confession, but they will now do so, and as they do so they will find certain passages knotty, crabbed and hard to digest. I do fear that some of our best young men, who meant to become ministers, may be allured away to other professions, and that those who go on to preach the gospel will find themselves annoyed and hindered by unwarranted expressions staring them in the face. In these circumstances I am of opinion that the Church should as speedily as possible leave out a few obnoxious passages not at all needful to the completeness of the expression of the system of doctrine, and put in the very front a full declaration of God's love to men and a free offer of salvation. This being done for the present, the Church should hold itself ready to meet the wants of the years and ages as they roll on. I am not sure whether the present terms of subscription to the Standards will be sufficient in the distant, or even in the near future. Some of our younger men are saying : "Nobody believes all the Confession ; everybody rejects some parts ; I may reject what displeases me." At this present time we get more than half our erudition from Germany, but also more than one-half of our heresies. Our Confession meets the heresies of the seventeenth, but not the more insidious ones of the nineteenth century. The Church has now to see that it has professors in our seminaries equal in learning to those in Germany. Ever since the Reformation, the Church has been amending its Confession. I confess that I should like to have in the Presbyterian Church a shorter and simpler creed than the Westminster Confession. At the same time our creed, be it shorter, or be it longer, must contain all the saving truths embraced in the consensus of the churches. I believe that in the age on which we have now entered, the Church will have to engage in a fight for "the faith once delivered to the saints." I hold that the Presbyterian Church is quite fit for that work. I deny that the great body of its ministers are Arminian or half-Arminian. I deny that Charles Hodge or Alexander Hodge have departed from the Confession of Faith. They may differ at times in the aspect they present and the phrases they use, but the truths are the same—those of the old Pauline theology. It was my privilege some years ago to bring all the evangelical Presbyterian churches throughout the world into an Alliance. To accomplish this, I crossed the Atlantic Ocean three or four times, corresponded with hundreds of individuals and with dozens of churches. In drawing out the Constitution of the Alliance, I took pains to let each church have its own creed. In the agitation now raised, each church will have to consider what is to be its Confession. Meanwhile, I trust the churches will correspond with one another and each help the other. This will not be done this year or next year, but will be the work of years to come. As the issue there will be a closer union and a wider extension of the Presbyterian churches all over the world.

PRINCETON, N. J., Oct. 1, 1889.

SICK PRAYER-MEETINGS.

BY REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER.

From *The Evangelist* (Presbyterian), New York, Oct. 24, 1889.

THE best place to feel the spiritual pulse of a Church is the prayer-meeting. If that is full of life, warmth, and vigor, then the Church is healthy; if the prayer-meeting declines, then the whole body is apt to suffer from this disease at the *heart.* The circulation of warm blood is impeded; devotion, which is the breath of the Church, becomes feeble, and pretty soon the "extremities" grow cold, as in the case of a dying man.

Prayer-meetings, like human bodies, are subject to a variety of diseases. Sometimes they suffer for want of a nourishing diet. No themes or topics are introduced to quicken thought, or arouse devotion, and the meeting is starved to a skeleton. But if some rousing practical topic is introduced; above all, if the vital truths of God's Word are presented, then the meeting has something to feed upon. The Holy Spirit honors the service that honors His precious Word. People run dry; even the best soon talk themselves out (and talk other people out of the house too), unless their souls are replenished from God's inexhaustible storehouse of wisdom, knowledge, and quickening power. Let the leader of the meeting choose some central truth or some enlivening practical passage of God's Word, and invite the people to come and talk about it, and weave it into their prayers. The weekly gatherings of Christians should be instructive as well as devotional. The pastor is not supposed to be the only man who is well up in Bible knowledge; some private Christians get insights into the "deep things of God" that a minister has not yet discovered. On the evenings when special prayer is made for the evangelization of the world ("Monthly Concerts" they used to be called), the meeting ought to be fed with fresh information from the missionary fields. If nothing is carried *into* the meeting, very little will be carried *out.* I suspect that a large proportion of church members saunter into their prayer-rooms in a listless, haphazard fashion, trusting that somebody else will have brought "five loaves or a few small fishes" for the evening's repast. They do not even carry a felt want, a fervent desire, a spiritual hunger there; they are apt to bring nothing and to carry nothing away. Scores of prayer-meetings starve to death. How can it be expected that unconverted persons or young people will ever be attracted to a meeting in which there is nothing to interest them, or even keep them awake? A devotional meeting is no more a self-feeding apparatus than a human body is; its supplies must come from God's Word, and the presence of the Holy Spirit, and from the *experiences* which the Spirit has awakened.

Many other prayer-meetings are suffering from what the doctors call "general debility." They have run down. The few people who do attend them, hear only the same stereotyped remarks, and the same stereotyped prayers week after week. The blood has been slowly drained away from the meeting until it has reached the last stages of consumption. A is too busy to attend the meetings any more. B is too tired after his day's work. C has her round of social engagements. D goes to his club, and E to his political headquarters, and F cares more to stay at home and read his newspaper. And so from the whole alphabet of delinquents comes the same "I pray thee have me excused." The faithful few who need the meeting the *least* are at their posts; the unfaithful majority who need to pray, and to be prayed for the *most* are absent. The feeble prayer-meeting not only makes the pastor's heart sick, but it sends its slow paralysis through the whole Church.

"What is the matter with us?" says one church member. "Had we not better look for another minister?" says another. "Perhaps we had better invite an evangelist to come and *revive* us," suggests a third brother. "People are attracted by fine music; let us get up a fine choir," suggests an æsthetic brother, who attends the opera generally on the prayer-meeting evening. Good friends, there is no mystery about the state of your church. You are drifting away from God! You are freezing to death, as people always freeze when they get too far from the source of all heat and life. That poor, sickly, declining prayer-meeting, is not merely a *symptom* of a declining church; it is one great *cause* of your decline. Revival and recovery, if it come at all, must come there, and had better begin there. The few who have stayed by the mercy-seat all along should direct their prayers "at a mark," and that is for the descent of the Holy Spirit as a fire from heaven. The deserters, who have brought themselves and the church also into its present diseased and enfeebled condition, must "face about," and go back to their deserted place of duty. Returning health cannot come from pulpit or music-loft, from minister or evangelist; it can only come *from* the Lord Jesus Christ, and it will only come *to* those who penitently pray for the blessing, and are ready to work to secure it. Until that sick prayer-meeting begins to amend, there is not much hope for your declining church. *Call for the Great Physician there!*

THE SUPERINTENDENT'S WORK.

BY THE REV. J. C. FERNALD.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, Oct. 19, 1889.

THE superintendent should superintend. That is what he is for.

Scattered forces accomplish little. Often they antagonize and neutralize each other. Steam, left to itself, fizzles idly away, and mingles with the air. Directed, compacted, it moves the engine's arms of steel, flying across the land, or throbbing amid the seas. On earth the only force that organizes and compacts other forces is some one human mind. A host of volunteers, brave as ever died for liberty, turn into headlong rout at one battle, for want of one mind that could mass and direct their valor. Another host conquer at another battle, because one man could move their battalions in harmony like the fingers of his hand. There are families where the only gifts that seem to be developed are combativeness and destructiveness. The members instinctively bristle at sight of each other. There are other families, no richer, no better educated—as regards what the schools can teach—whose members never seem to have any temper, and instinctively to find the goodness, beauty, and power of all the rest. What is the secret of it?

There is a quiet little mother, who does not seem, many times, to be doing so very much, but to be pretty much everywhere. She deftly ties up a cut finger; she glues on a doll's head; she finds a string for the irrepressible four-year-old to play horse with, to give him motion enough; and gets the tired little two-year-old to sit down on the rug and find the glorious pictures in an old *Century*, where a battle-field turns into a show of fine horses, and a soap advertisement becomes a lovely baby-picture with a thrilling story attached. In the midst of all, a thousand domestic occupations go on, each receiving at the right moment a touch of the achieving hand, or the guidance of a directing word.

Let that magical person depart, and a strong man wrestle with the problem, and try to find the things that are all out of sight, and all wanted, and all wanted right away. Some imperceptible mismanagement finds unsuspected tempers, as the claws in the cat's soft foot come out when you stroke her fur the wrong way. The wearied man comes from the herculean exertion with the conviction of what a wonderful thing it is to organize a home. That is just what we want of a superintendent—to organize a school, and keep the organization in smooth, effective working order all the time.

This work of leadership is the greatest work man does on earth, and in which he most reflects the image of the Lord God omnipotent. It is much to do the whole work of one man or one woman. It is more to organize the work of many. He who can do this can work in many places at once. He accomplishes the mathematical impossibility of acting where he is not. He realizes the fable of the giant Briareus, and has a hundred hands. He can give other people's money—with their most hearty consent. He can pour out upon the world the riches of learning on matters which he does not understand—all by knowing whom to set to doing the thing that most needs to be done.

The superintendent should know what each teacher is capable of; how many scholars can be profitably taught in one class; when an overgrown class can be divided, and when the attempt to do so would only scatter it to the four winds; when scholars should be promoted; what classes will be congenial to new-comers, and where such would be like fishes out of water, to keep very far from that shore ever after.

I am reminded of a little adventure on one of the six-horse White Mountain stages. Our driver was a genuine specimen of the tall, lank, slab-sided Yankee, with a thin face that looked as if it might have been cut out of an oak plank, but a pair of keen gray eyes that were wonderfully alive. The stage rolled smoothly along, with the leaders often out of sight around the turns, the green branches dipping down and brushing our faces as we sat on the top—a precipice often going sheer down on one side, and a bank rising sheer up on the other. Our Jehu did not seem to be doing anything in particular, and nothing appeared easier or simpler than to drive a six-horse stage as he did it. Beside him sat a short, fat, important man, who "talked horse" incessantly, giving a good many hints and suggestions to the young driver, which he received good-naturedly, but with a little air of amusement. At length the stage stopped at a bridge over a mountain stream. The driver handed the lines to the horseman beside him, saying, "Just hold these while I give 'em some water." He took a bucket from under the rail of the bridge, filled it at the stream, and gave each horse a drink, very carefully and deliberately hung his bucket back, climbed into his seat, and clucked to his horses, saying to his self-important friend, "You just drive 'em a little, while I put on my gloves." It took him a long while to draw on those gauntlet gloves, the horses meanwhile listening backward, tossing their heads, biting at each other, and going each for himself, no two pulling together. The road appeared to be full of ruts, and the coach to find them all. It rolled like a ship at sea, and the great trunks began to shift and strain in their fastenings.

The driver had at length got those gloves on. A dry smile wrinkled his cheek like a summer breeze on water. He put his hand down and picked up the long whip, the lash all coiled around the stock, and began unrolling it to the breeze. The ambitious substitute, now flushed and anxious, turned to him with a despairing "Oh, don't!" But the long lash floated out behind the coach, and came back with a sharp crack behind the leaders' ears. The whole team plunged, but in six different directions, and the man who held the reins reached them over helplessly to the real driver, saying, "Here, take 'em." He slipped them between his fingers, worked quietly with them a minute or two, shortening one here, loosening another there. The horses felt some magical change. Each pair came up evenly to their collars, pricked their ears forward, and bent their heads toward each other, with an air that said, "This is all right." The leaders flashed by the wayside bushes where the boughs brushed their fine ears, the next pair came with taut traces in their steps, and the strong wheelers settled to their heavy work with an air of perfect contentment. The coach rolled smoothly again, somehow missing all the rocks and ruts that had been so numerous before. The driver smiled his dry smile once more, and called out to them encouragingly, "There, children, your father's got home again!" Then, turning to the disappointed man beside him, he said good-naturedly, "'Tain't any wonder a stranger can't do it. He don't know the critters' mouths, nor yet their dispositions."

To hold all the lines of the school well in hand, all drawing, and none strained, and to guide the whole enterprise smoothly and speedily along the road of righteousness, is the greatest work a superintendent can do.

Let us take his hour. He has studied the lesson as faithfully as any teacher. He comes to the school in ample time. He looks rapidly over the field as the school assembles, noting what teachers are in their places, and who may be absent, and whether the absent have provided a substitute, as he impresses it upon them that they should do, unless he is notified in time to provide one before the session. Yet he keeps always in mind some whom he may call upon to teach in an unforeseen emergency. He rapidly decides what he will do if the expected teachers do not come. He reverently conducts the reading of the lesson, or, better if possible, of some related Scripture, if the school are provided with Bibles, as they should be. He makes sure all papers needed are promptly on hand. He suggests to secretary and librarian anything needed in their departments. While the teaching is going on, he silently reviews his army, noting what classes are interested, which keep full, seeing that no visitor, young or old, fails of a kind invitation to a seat in some class. Sometimes he steps into the infant class, says some kind word to the little ones, possibly tells a brief story to impress some thought of the lesson. Sometimes he stops by the Bible class or some other long enough to get the run of the teaching, to ask some suggestive question, or answer some perplexing one. He closes as sharply on time as he begins. If he sees reason for a three or five-minute talk, to impress some serious thought or some practical duty, he speaks clearly, kindly, and so briefly that the teachers and scholars have no anxiety lest he shall keep them too long from their dinners, or from another service. He closes with a selected hymn true to the heart of the lesson. When the school breaks up, he says a kind word here and there, learns if any absent scholars are sick, etc. As far as one man can, he sends all away cheerful and hopeful, and with the feeling that their school is one of the dearest places in the world.

When he goes home, he takes all reverently to the Captain of salvation in fervent prayer, and all the week does all that life's opportunities allow him for the prosperity of the school and the salvation of the scholars. He has a friendly visit to some sickroom, a hopeful, inspiring talk with some discouraged teacher, a few kindly, thoughtful words with some young man or boy in the midst of the city's temptations or discouraged with the seemingly thankless work of some lonely farm. None can measure the amount of good that can be done by a superintendent who is a superintendent and a Christian all the time. In school and out, he is the unifying force to make the whole school act together as the heart of one man.

NEW YORK CITY.

THE NICENE CREED AND THE "FILIOQUE."

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Oct. 12, 1889.

BY the action of the General Convention "the Nicene Creed" must henceforth be used in the celebration of the Holy Communion at least five times in the year.

The debate on this subject was in some respects unsatisfactory. Notwithstanding the admirable precision of the language of Dr. Kedney and other speakers, an erroneous impression was created in some minds that the doctrine of the Church was the matter at issue, and in the reports of the daily press statements to that effect were freely made.

We need not assure the readers of the *Churchman* that no question of doctrine was really involved in the action of the Convention. In all Catholic Churches it has for ages been customary to recite the Nicene Creed at the celebration of the Holy Communion. The action of the American Church a hundred years ago in leaving it optional with the clergy to use or omit that creed was regarded in England as a serious mistake. The present action which requires it to be said on certain days only, is merely a restoration in part of the former law of the Church, and still falls far short of the established custom in most parishes.

The objection to the measure was not grounded on a disbelief of the creed as it stands, since a large majority of those who opposed it have no objection whatever to the use of the same creed in other services of the Church. We regret that their side of the discussion was not more satisfactorily represented. The history of the clause, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son" was not clearly nor even accurately given; and if it had been better set forth, it is possible that the final vote on the question might have been less sweeping than it was. The anathema of the Council of Ephesus does not apply to the western form of the creed, since that form is not in the least particular inconsistent with "the faith of Nicæa." The definition of the Council of Chalcedon, however, condemns not only deviations from that "faith," but also every variation from the "symbol," that is to say, the very identical form of the Constantinopolitan Creed, which was expressly read, approved and set forth at Chalcedon, together with that of Nicæa. It is on that ground that the Orientals so strenuously object to the words "and the Son" which have been inserted by western Christians. Even the Orientals admit that there is a sense in which those words are true, namely, that the Holy Spirit, "Who proceedeth from the Father," is also sent by the Son; but they insist that no provincial, national, or patriarchal division of the Church Catholic has a right to add one syllable to the formula established by the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon. The reunion of the Churches of the East and the West will probably never be possible until that cause of difference shall have been removed.

If we rightly understand the position of those who oppose the action of the Convention, and we think we do understand the mind of the most learned men among them. it is not to the creed itself, as an expression of belief, that they objected, but to the introduction into the Holy Communion of a form of words which many millions of Catholic Christians could not conscientiously use. To its use in other services of the Church the same objection does not exist. No one is obliged by any divine law to join in those services; and if they contain anything to which he cannot on catholic grounds assent, he is at liberty to absent himself from them. The Holy Communion, however, is of divine institution, and to participate in it is a duty of divine obligation. It has therefore been felt by many eminent persons both in England and America that unless the very formula of the Council of Chalcedon could be used in the celebration of the Holy Communion, it would be better not to use a formula which to many millions of Christians is a cause of offence.

This opinion has weight in itself and also in the character of some of its advocates; and we should have been rejoiced to hear it somewhat more clearly set forth in the House of Deputies. To those who are disappointed at the final action of the Convention because of the offence to the Orientals there ought at least to be some consolation in the fact that the American Church at least does not stand apart from the rest of the Occident.

At any rate and however much the public press may have misunderstood, and therefore misrepresented, the discussion the doctrine of the Church was not brought into question in connection with this matter.

THAT EVENING CONGREGATION.

From *The Advance* (Congregationalist), Chicago, Oct. 31, 1889.

The paucity of the number composing the evening congregations at most of our churches forms the theme of lamentations as common as they are mournful. Preachers of distinguished ability, whose congregations in the morning number a thousand or more, seem obliged to be content in the evening with a congregation of two hundred or one hundred, or even less. That fact is evident, that to hear the best preaching of the best preachers the people of the churches will not come of a Sabbath evening.

The explanation of the fact is also evident. The explanation we believe to be in large part this: the people of the larger churches in the cities live in all parts of those cities. They are not willing to take themselves away from their homes for the sake of coming to church. They feel that the duties they owe their children and the duties they owe their homes are more important than the duties they owe their church of attending a second service. We cannot question the fact, and the character of most of those people who thus absent themselves prevents us from discrediting their motives. There are those who seriously fear that the second service, as a service of worship for the people of the church, is gone, and gone not to return.

In this condition the minister is subject to temptations of diverse character and power. He is tempted to feel that in one respect his work is a failure, and he is inclined to withdraw from his ministry. We know of one prominent minister, formerly the pastor of a prominent church of this city, who frequently vowed to himself on returning from his thinly attended evening service, that he would offer his resignation the next Sabbath morning. We sympathize with the minister who is thus tempted. The temptation is strong. He feels that his church is not loyal to him as he represents the cause of Christ.

The minister is also subjected to the temptation to introduce into his pulpit unworthy subjects for treatment, or to introduce unworthy methods of treating worthy subjects. He is tempted to become sensational in the worst sense of a bad word. He is also tempted to try to cajole the people away from their sitting-rooms in the evening by praise services, courses of sermons on the patriarchs, and attempts to solve the problems of the political economy. Usually he runs the gamut of these various methods. Each for a time works well, but each in the end works badly. At last he is left in a condition not worse than he was at first, but in very much the same condition.

We believe, however, that the minister should yield to one allurement which is offered to him, and that is the allurement to make his Sunday evening services popular by preaching the Gospel. Let him endeavor to bring in those who are without, let him strive to make the church attractive in the evening to that great class of people who have no regular church home, or who are unable for any reason to come to the morning services. We would have him use every right means for making the service worthy of the people. We would not suggest to him to preach upon sensational themes, or to preach the Gospel in a sensational way; but we would have him preach those doctrines which usually cluster about the word salvation. We are confident that if the evening service is to be saved to the people, it must be saved in a legitimate way. Any other way of saving it is too costly.

The question of the size of the evening congregation at any one church is not the important question that it is usually thought to be. It is an important question, but two other questions are much more important;

one, the instruction which the congregation that does assemble receives, the other, that the dignity of the church is not sacrificed in gathering the congregation. A minister sometimes purchases success for himself in his evening service through degrading the influence of the church and lessening the power of the Gospel. The minister who draws congregations by unworthy methods is thereby hurting every other minister to draw a congregation by worthy methods. The Congregational minister who fills his pews in the evening by preaching upon the prayer-cure, or the telephone, or the telegraph, or "a tour of the cities of Europe," is hurting every other Congregational pulpit in the land, and preventing it from doing its legitimate work in a legitimate way. We believe that the minister who thus draws congregations pays a price too high either for his own interest, or for the interest of the church, Congregational and universal.

Although we have expressed our opinion that no legitimate means will suffice to bring out large congregations in the evening composed of the regular worshippers, yet we do express our opinion that it is the duty of many of the regular worshippers to come to the Sabbath evening service. The church cannot do its duty to those who are without, by means of a public service, except those who are within attend the same service. A minister may preach never so eloquently and attractively and persuasively, if the regular attendants are absent from the service, he cannot deal with those who may be touched by his message, as they ought to be dealt with. The service of Sabbath evening should be of that character to necessitate the second or after-meeting. But this after-meeting is almost of no use, is indeed practically impossible, except as the Christian members of the congregation help to conduct it. The evangelistic work of such a service depends upon workers; if the workers are absent, the work itself cannot be done.

"WHITHER?"

From *The Universalist*, Chicago, Oct. 26, 1889.

THE discussion which is now in progress among the Presbyterians regarding the revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith, bids fair to remove the theological storm centre from the Congregational to the Presbyterian body. It is likely that, as the debate moves on, it will transpire that the Presbyterians are as rapidly forsaking the ancient land-marks as their Congregational brethren. Heretofore it has been the conclusion that the new theology men were confined to the Congregationalists, but events are rapidly proving that the Presbyterians are not to be without an influential representation in the movement for the reconstruction of theology.

Presbyterianism has so long prided itself on adhering inflexibly to the old dogmas of the faith that it was urged some time ago, that in case the action of the American Board touching a future probation led to any unwillingness on the part of young men to enter the missionary service, the Presbyterian body could furnish from its theological seminaries young men in sufficient numbers, who were sound in the faith, to make up the deficiency. This was the result of the confidence which was cherished that the new heresy had made no perceptible inroads in the Presbyterian denomination. Recent developments go to prove that this confidence was not well founded, and that Presbyterianism itself has more in common than was supposed with the new movement among the Congregationalists.

One of the most significant developments in this direction is to be found in the volume entitled "Whither?" by Professor Charles A. Briggs, D.D., of the Union Theological Seminary, the Presbyterian institution of New York. Only published a few weeks, it is already discovered that this volume is packed full of heresy, and is a veritable bomb-shell in the camp of conservative Presbyterian divinity. Among other startling declarations, testifying to the movement of the new thought among the hitherto inflexible Presbyterians, Professor Briggs declares:

"If this life be a probation, then there is no ground in the Scriptures or in the Westminster symbols, or in sound reason, why this probation should not be extended into the middle state for those who have no probation here."

This declaration from so eminent a Presbyterian, cannot fail of precipitating the controversy touching the extent of probation into the front rank of controversy, and placing the Presbyterians on the defensive on the question which has almost rent the Congregationalists in twain. The high character and standing of Dr. Briggs, and the fact that he is a teacher in their leading theological seminary, which has been long the fortress of Calvinistic teaching under Dr. Shedd, will not only challenge attention to this explicit declaration, but must also bring the question of a second probation to the front for immediate discussion. And so the work goes on.

But it is not alone on this question of a future probation that "Whither?" will prove an epoch-making book among the Presbyterians. It also deals with the Westminster Confession, and the devotion which clings to that ancient document, in a very striking and suggestive manner. It meets the current argument of the Presbyterians that the Confession is too ancient and time-honored a symbol to be revised in this nineteenth century, by quoting from church history and eminent Presbyterian authorities, facts which go to prove that already, "more than half of the work of the Westminster divines has been entirely set aside," and that on many vital points of doctrine, the church has already departed from the original Presbyterian faith. These things have been urged over and over again in the debate between Liberals and Conservatives, but in Dr. Briggs's volume they assume a new importance and must initiate a momentous discussion among the Presbyterians.

The Presbyterians have always been quite indignant at Universalists and Unitarians for charging upon them the belief in the damnation of non-elect infants, and have contended that the Confession of Faith taught no such doctrine; that it was an unfair interpretation, and not to be justified by an appeal to the standards, when the original meaning was taken into account. Dr. Briggs makes short work with this plea. "We are able to say," he remarks, "that the Westminster divines were unanimous on the question of the salvation of elect infants only. We have examined the greater part of the writings of the Westminster divines and have not been able to find any different opinion from the extracts we have given. The Presbyterian churches have departed from their standards on this question, and it is simple honesty to acknowledge it. We are at liberty to amend the Confession, but we have no right to distort it and to pervert its grammatical and historical meaning." This from a special student of the Westminster standards, and the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century divines, is enough to put the veto hereafter on the disingenuous manner in which this doctrine has been usually defended by the Presbyterians.

There are many other important matters discussed in Dr. Briggs's book, but we can only notice the above points at present. His work is the result of twenty years' "study of the Westminster standards in the light of the Westminster divines and their Puritan associates and precursors." On the questions noted above it will give the Presbyterians ample food for reflection, and cannot fail of stirring the waters to their utmost depths. Dr. Briggs is an advocate of progress in the Presbyterian ranks and proposes to "break the mould of doctrine" and set forth the vital and essential doctrines of Presbyterianism in a new form, more in consonance with the spirit of the age. With what success his work will be attended remains to be seen. "Whither?" is at all events, a remarkable volume, and will take its place among other volumes embodying the spirit of the nineteenth century, emanating from the orthodox church. It will be a companion for "Progressive Orthodoxy," by the Andover men, Munger's "Freedom of Faith," and Mulford's "Republic of God."

MR. BELLAMY'S PARABLE.

BY REV. HENRY M. KING, D.D.

From *The Standard* (Baptist), Chicago, Oct. 10, 1889.

Mr. Edward Bellamy's book, "Looking Backward," has attracted considerable attention and has had a remarkable sale. One hundred thousand copies have been called for in numerous editions. The author is reported to have said that originally it was undertaken as "a literary fantasy," with no thought of its being regarded as furnishing a basis for the solution of labor problems and for the reconstruction of society. That it has been accepted as an offered solution of the numerous and serious ills that afflict our social life is very evident. Mr. Bellamy is probably not a little amused at the serious treatment which his book has received at the hands of the public. But it is impossible now to divest the author's conception of the popular conception. Indeed the book must be treated in the light of the impression which it has produced.

The description of the social state in the year 2000 when the sleeper awakes from his long sleep in the subterranean chamber, is delightfully fanciful and ingenious. Many things then described as actual may now be looked upon as probable, in view of the marvellous progress of the last hundred years. Of course the author finds it convenient to leave many questions unanswered as to the working of the new social system. The reader must not be too inquisitive. He must be satisfied with the general outline and let alone the details. The general outline is certainly made very attractive by the author's skilful pen. It is not the picture so much as it is the looking backward that provokes criticism.

The book presents a condition of things without giving an adequate cause, a result without suggesting any sufficient forces to produce it, a sort of millennium without an antecedent gospel or a reigning Christ. It takes no fair account of the presence and power of sin as a disturbing element in society, or of the evil tendency, the depravity of human nature, deep-rooted and humanly indestructible, as an actual factor in the social problem. In a word, it rests upon the false assumption that, the outward circumstances being changed, the motives to sin are taken away and the tendencies to sin become inoperative; that environment is mightier than the law of heredity.

Let us now listen to the parable which sets forth the philosophy of "Looking Backward."

"To put the whole matter into the nutshell of a parable, let me compare humanity in the olden time to a rosebush planted in a swamp, watered by black bog-water, breathing miasmatic fogs by day and chilled with poison dews at night. Innumerable generations had done their best to make it bloom, but beyond an occasional half-opened bud with a worm at the heart, their efforts had been unsuccessful. Many, indeed, claimed that the bush was no rosebush at all, but a noxious shrub, fit only to be uprooted and burned. The gardeners, for the most part, however, held that the bush belonged to the rose family, but had some ineradicable taint about it, which prevented the buds from coming out, and accounted for its generally sickly condition. There were a few, indeed, who maintained that the stock was good enough, that the trouble was in the bog, and that under more favorable conditions the plant might be expected to do better. But these persons were not regular gardeners, and being condemned by the latter as mere theorists and day-dreamers, were, for the most part, so regarded by the people.

"Moreover, urged some eminent moral philosopher, even conceding for the sake of the argument, that the bush might possibly do better elsewhere, it was a more valuable discipline for the buds to try to bloom in a bog than it would be under more favorable conditions. The buds that succeeded in opening might indeed be rare, and the flowers pale and scentless, but they represented far more moral effort than if they had bloomed spontaneously in a garden.

"The regular gardeners and the moral philosophers had their way. The bush remained in the bog and the old course of treatment went on. Continually new varieties of forcing mixtures were applied to the roots, and more recipes than could be numbered, each declared by its advocates the best and only suitable preparation, were used to kill the vermin and remove the mildew. This went on a very long time. Occasionally some one claimed to observe a slight improvement in the appearance of the bush, but there were quite as many who declared that it did not look as well as it used to. On the whole there could not be said to be any marked change.

"Finally, during a period of general despondency as to the prospects of the bush where it was, the idea of transplanting it was again mooted, and this time found favor. 'Let us try it,' was the general voice. 'Perhaps it may thrive better elsewhere, and here it is certainly doubtful if it be worth cultivating any longer.' So it came about that the rosebush of humanity was transplanted, and set in sweet, warm, dry earth, where the sun bathed it, the stars wooed it, and the south wind caressed it. Then it appeared that it was indeed a rosebush. The vermin and the mildew disappeared, and the bush was covered with most beautiful red roses, whose fragrance filled the world."

Such is the parable. It contains the author's theory of the improvement of humanity. Humanity is the rosebush now sickly and unfruitful. It only needs to change its environment to be made a perfect rosebush, and bear an abundance of beautiful roses. Some power outside of the rosebush must change its location. Some power residing in humanity must change its circumstances and all will be well. Humanity will be no longer sickly and unfruitful.

The parable is very beautiful and very specious. It has one weakness, it is utterly false to the facts in the case. The trouble is not with the soil, but with the rosebush. The rosebush was originally planted in the soil of Eden, and there it fell. It wasn't the bog that made the rosebush unfruitful, but it was the rosebush that made the bog rotten and miasmatic. A change of soil will not affect the nature of the bush. It will go on perverting the soil. New conditions, if they could be brought about, would soon become old conditions, unless the occupant be made new.

Mr. Bellamy's parable reminds us of another parable, one which God has given us in his Word. Let us now listen to that one.

"Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill, and he fenced it and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein; and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes brought it forth wild grapes?"

Such is God's parable. It is certainly implied that the vine was "set in sweet, warm, dry earth, where the sun bathed it, the stars wooed it, and the south wind caressed it." And yet notwithstanding its excellent care and its favorable environment, it brought forth wild grapes.

Which parable shall we accept? Which teaching is in harmony with the facts, and which will give us the true working theory of life? According to Mr. Bellamy, will not humanity find more comfort in looking backward from an imaginary future than in looking forward from an actual present? If we blind our eyes to the nature of the disease, all our prescriptions will be fallacious. No outward application can meet the necessities of the case. God's parable goes to the root of the matter, and the gospel of Christ is based upon the fact that what is needed is not a change of soil, but a change of soul.

It is true that there is a very general unrest and dissatisfaction with the condition of things. It is a good sign, a hopeful omen. Social disturbances and financial crises are certain to be followed by religious awakenings. Men are constrained to seek after rest and comfort in God and religion. They see the vanity of all things earthly. Their grip on earth is loosened that their grip on heaven may be tightened.

Moreover there is an instinctive hope in the human breast of something better in the future for man and society. It is this instinctive looking forward that made "Looking Backward" possible. There is another Eden before us. The golden age of the world is yet to come. It is no time for despair, but for faith, and for the recognition and vigorous use of the means for human advancement which God himself has provided in the gospel. This is the only remedy for our social ills; it contains the solution of the grave problems that are perplexing thoughtful minds, and furnishes the divine cure for all the moral diseases that afflict humanity, in the individual and in the mass.

1. The gospel furnishes the true rule of life in all relations. Apply the golden rule to business and to domestic affairs, and what changes would be brought about, what cessation of strife and painful friction, what universal peace and harmony!

2. The gospel supplies the very strongest motives to right action, viz., love to God. The enthusiasm of humanity is born of the enthusiasm of Divinity. Human brotherhood rests on the divine Fatherhood. He who loves God will love his brother also.

3. The gospel insists that every man must be changed in heart and nature. It makes a new society by making new men. It purifies and elevates the social state by purifying individual members. Its fundamental postulate is that life determines environment, not environment life. New men will make a new heaven and a new earth. There never was such a time to preach the doctrine of the new birth as this. The power of Christ regenerating and saving the soul is the hope of society and of the world. "And He that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new."

ALBANY, N. Y.

DECISION OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY IN THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Nov. 16, 1889.

AMERICAN Churchmen seldom comment on the affairs of other Churches unless the matter in question is such as to affect the interests of all Churches. For this reason the startling decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he asserted his legal power to try a bishop of his province in his archiepiscopal court, was received in this country with slight remark. The gravity of the decision and the serious consequences to which it might lead in the British and Colonial Churches were obvious enough. It was also very certain that it must ultimately, though indirectly, have a weighty influence on the course of affairs in the American Church. Primarily, however, it concerned the Church of England alone, and as the archbishop's decision was applauded by very different schools of English Churchmen, there appeared to be no good reason why Americans should discuss it.

Of late it has begun to be understood that the archbishop's judgment is by no means universally approved in England. It is said to be disapproved by some, possibly by most, of his grace's suffragans, and formal protests against its validity and expediency have been extensively signed by dignitaries and beneficed clergy of the Church of England. The discussion which has thus arisen is of more than local importance. It includes the whole subject of the history and rights of the Episcopal order. It concerns the fundamental constitution of the Church of Christ, and demands the earnest consideration of all Catholic Churches.

To the American Church, this judgment is of indirect but grave importance. In this Church few things are clearer than that the adoption of some sort of provincial system will very soon be indispensable; but before any acceptable plan for its adoption can be devised, many prejudices and misconceptions must be cleared away. As history records the existence of no provincial system anywhere in the world which did not include metropolitans of one name or another, it is as certain as anything can be that in course of time American provinces will have metropolitans; and yet it is very safe to say that if the prerogative claimed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as metropolitan of his province, could possibly become a precedent for American metropolitans, American Churchmen would prefer to do without provinces or metropolitans for a long while to come. If we are not mistaken, the judgment of the archbishop raises an additional obstacle to the adoption of a provincial system of any kind in the American Church, because it will suggest to bishops, as well as to clergy and laity, the possibility of future consequences to which they would never give their deliberate consent. For these reasons, therefore, we think it right to say something of this important matter.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION.

The judgment of the archbishop affirms that he has the right, as metropolitan, to summon, to try, and to pronounce judgment upon any bishop of his province who may be accused of ecclesiastical offences. In other words, the archbishop claims to be *Judex Ordinarius* of his suffragans, and, in the matter of discipline, *episcopus episcoporum.*

The first observation we have to make is that this claim of the archbishop is unquestionably well founded. As a matter of law, he undoubtedly has that power. So far as the mediæval laws of the Church of England were not repealed or modified at the Reformation, those laws are still in force. The canonical and customary rights of metropolitans over their suffragans were neither repealed nor modified at that time; and since it is indisputable that metropolitans, before the Reformation, both could and did exercise sole jurisdiction over their suffragans, it follows that their successors retain the same jurisdiction. From a legal point of view, therefore, the archbishop's judgment is unassailable.

At the same time it were much to be wished that the archbishop had felt free and seen fit to let his mediæval prerogative quietly pass away from him and his successors. By calling his suffragans to sit with him as a synodical body he would substantially, if not formally, have accepted the model of the Primitive Church, which the Church of England professes to follow, and his action would have been a precedent which would not hereafter be disregarded. Thus he would have removed from the Reformed Church of England an inherited and wrongful anomaly; for the power of an archbishop to sit as sole judge of his brethren, however legal it may be in England, is not a primitive power of metropolitans; it involves a fatal contradiction of the fundamental principles of Episcopal polity; it is a mere remnant of a mediæval system so tyrannously oppressive that the modern papacy was invented as a means of escape from its yoke. This is mere matter of well-known history.

METROPOLITANS, PRIMITIVE AND FEUDAL.

In the Primitive Church no metropolitan ever dreamed of exercising personal jurisdiction over his brethren. The jurisdiction of his province belonged, not to him, but to the episcopate of the province. The synod of the province alone was competent to try a bishop, and the metropolitan himself was as amenable to the jurisdiction of that synod as the humblest bishop who sat in it. The metropolitan was simply *primus inter pares,* chief among his equals, and that in the same sense, and no other, in which the Presiding Bishop of the American Church is chief among his episcopal brethren.

It came to pass too soon in the history of the Church that its episcopate became a prelacy. That misfortune did not happen in the days of persecution; but as soon as the Church became a power with which statesmen were obliged to reckon, the position of a bishop became an object of ambition. At the court of Byzantium bishops were favored courtiers, and the episcopate was too often sought as a safe and swift means of temporal promotion. At the West, when the barbarians had overrun the Roman empire and adopted Christianity, the bad example of the East was quickly followed.

The bishop was a baron; a metropolitan was the peer of princes. Feudal theories were applied to the polity of the Church; and as every feudal lord was subject to his over-lord, and might be summoned to appear for trial in his lord's court, so the baron-bishops were subjected to their princely metropolitan, and might be tried in his court. In complete defiance of the ancient canons, provincial synods ceased to be regularly held, and the jurisdiction, which of right belonged to synods, passed for the most part to metropolitans.

THE FALSE DECRETALS: RISE OF THE PAPACY.

This change of the ecclesiastical constitution was not immediate but gradual, and its consequences were not everywhere equally apparent. In England the evil was less than elsewhere; in Germany it was deplorable. In Germany the tyranny of the metropolitans became insupportable, and led to the most marvellous fraud which ever disgraced the Church of Christ. It seems now to be historically certain that the false decretals, on the faith of which the entire fabric of the modern papacy was built up, were invented, not at Rome, but by some obscure German bishop, in order to establish in the papacy a power to which appeals might be brought from the unjust judgments and other oppressions of metropolitans. The learning of the time was not critical, and the pretended dicta of fathers and councils, of which the false decretals were composed, soon became maxims of papal jurisprudence. In effect they were a logical application of the feudal system to the government of the Church, and recognized in the Pope a suzerain to whom all other lords of the Church owed supreme allegiance. Thus the Pope claimed the same rights over metropolitans which metropolitans claimed and exercised over their suffragans, and metropolitans soon found in the Pope a lord paramount to whose authority the proudest of them was compelled to bow. It is idle to suppose that an institution like that of the papacy can be brought into existence by mere fraud. There was need of the papacy in the middle ages, or it could never have come into existence; and nothing in those ages contributed more to that fatal necessity than the feudal and utterly uncatholic usurpations of metropolitans.

METROPOLITAN PREROGATIVE IN ENGLAND NO PRECEDENT FOR OTHER CHURCHES.

Henry VIII. made short work of the papal authority in England; but Henry was nothing more than a sagacious and determined statesman. He was no reformer of the Church. When the Reformation came, nothing was changed that could be wisely let alone. The laws of the Church were not abolished at one fell swoop in the "root and branch" style of the Puritans. There was nothing at the time to call special attention to the powers of metropolitans, and accordingly they were let alone. Those powers, therefore, remained in law; and there was no longer even a pope to whom a bishop might appeal from an archbishop's judgment. It is a wonderful proof of the characteristic moderation and discretion of the Church of England that this anomaly has bred no discontent, has led to no confusion, has, in fact, been clean forgotten. It is an ecclesiastical anomaly nevertheless. It is utterly uncatholic. It is a mere remnant of ecclesiastical feudalism. Now that it has been revived and practically applied in an important case, the Church of England will doubtless deal with it in her usual moderate and sagacious way; but if it should stand forever as the law for England, it can never be a precedent elsewhere. In the American Church, at least, mediæval precedents of that kind never will and never can be followed. In such a matter, the only precedents by which the American Church can be bound, and the only precedents she can follow, are those of the Primitive Church of Christ.

AGNOSTICISM.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

(Continued from the November number, p. 100.)

So I declare, as plainly as I can, that I am unable to show cause why these transferable devils should not exist; nor can I deny that, not merely the whole Roman Church, but many Wacean "infidels" of no mean repute, do honestly and firmly believe that the activity of such-like demonic beings is in full swing in this year of grace 1889.

Nevertheless, as good Bishop Butler says, "probability is the guide of life," and it seems to me that this is just one of the cases in which the canon of credibility and testimony, which I have ventured to lay down, has full force. So that, with the most entire respect for many (by no means for all) of our witnesses for the truth of demonology, ancient and modern, I conceive their evidence on this particular matter to be ridiculously insufficient to warrant their conclusion.[*]

After what has been said I do not think that any sensible man, unless he happen to be angry, will accuse me of "contradicting the Lord and his apostles" if I reiterate my total disbelief in the whole Gadarene story. But, if that story is discredited, all the other stories of demoniac possession fall under suspicion. And if the belief in demons and demoniac possession, which forms the somber background of the whole picture of primitive Christianity presented to us in the New Testament, is shaken, what is to be said, in any case, of the uncorroborated testimony of the Gospels with respect to the "unseen world"?

I am not aware that I have been influenced by any more bias in regard to the Gadarene story than I have been in dealing with other cases of like kind the investigation of which has interested me. I was brought up in the strictest school of evangelical orthodoxy; and, when I was old enough to think for myself, I started upon my journey of inquiry with little doubt about the general truth of what I had been taught; and with that feeling of the unpleasantness of being called an "infidel" which, we are told, is so right and proper. Near my journey's end, I find myself in a condition of something more than mere doubt about these matters.

In the course of other inquiries, I have had to do with fossil remains which looked quite plain at a distance, and became more and more indistinct as I tried to define their outline by close inspection. There was something there—something which, if I could win assurance about it, might mark a new epoch in the history of the earth; but, study as long as I might, certainty eluded my grasp. So has it been with me in my efforts to define the grand figure of Jesus as it lies in the primary strata of Christian literature. Is he the kindly, peaceful Christ depicted in the Catacombs? Or is he the stern judge who frowns above the altar of SS. Cosmas and Damianus? Or can he be rightly represented in the bleeding ascetic, broken down by physical pain, of too many mediæval pictures? Are we to accept the Jesus of the second, or the Jesus of the fourth Gospel, as the true Jesus? What did he really say and do; and how much that is attributed to him in speech and action is the embroidery of the various parties into which his followers tended to split themselves within twenty years of his death, when even the threefold tradition was only nascent?

If any one will answer these questions for me with something more to the point than feeble talk about the "cowardice of agnosticism," I shall be deeply his debtor. Unless and until they are satisfactorily answered, I say of agnosticism in this matter, "*J'y suis, et j'y reste.*"

But, as we have seen, it is asserted that I have no business to call myself an agnostic; that if I am not a Christian I am an infidel; and that I ought to call myself by that name of "unpleasant significance." Well, I do not care much what I am called by other people, and, if I had at my side all those who since the Christian era have been called infidels by other folks, I could not desire better company. If these are my ancestors, I prefer, with the old Frank, to be with them wherever they are. But there are several points in Dr. Wace's contention which must be eliminated before I can even think of undertaking to carry out his wishes. I must, for instance, know what a Christian is. Now what is a Christian? By whose authority is the signification of that term defined? Is there any doubt that the immediate followers of Jesus, the "sect of the Nazarenes," were strictly orthodox Jews, differing from other Jews not more than the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Essenes differed from one another; in fact, only in the belief that the Messiah, for whom the rest of their nation waited, had come? Was not their chief, "James, the brother of the Lord," reverenced alike by Sadducee, Pharisee, and Nazarene? At the famous conference which, according to the Acts, took place at Jerusalem, does not James declare that "myriads" of Jews, who, by that time had become Nazarenes, were "all zealous for the law?" Was not the name of "Christian" first used to denote the converts to the doctrine promulgated by Paul and Barnabas at Antioch? Does the subsequent history of Christianity leave any doubt that, from this time forth, the "little rift within the lute," caused by the new teaching developed, if not inaugurated, at Antioch, grew wider and wider, until the two types of doctrine irreconcilably diverged? Did not the primitive Nazarenism or Ebionism develop into the Nazarenism, and Ebionism, and Elkasaitism of later ages, and finally die out in obscurity and condemnation as damnable heresy; while the younger doctrine throve and pushed out its shoots into that endless variety of sects, of which the three strongest survivors are the Roman and Greek Churches and modern Protestantism?

---

[*] Their arguments, in the long run, are always reducible to one form. Otherwise trustworthy witnesses affirm that such and such events took place. These events are inexplicable, except the agency of "spirits" is admitted. Therefore "spirits" were the cause of the phenomena.

And the heads of the reply are always the same. Remember Goethe's aphorism: "Alles factische ist schon Theorie." Trustworthy witnesses are constantly deceived, or deceive themselves, in their interpretation of sensible phenomena. No one can prove that the sensible phenomena, in these cases, could be caused only by the agency of spirits; and there is abundant ground for believing that they may be produced in other ways.

Therefore, the utmost that can be reasonably asked for, on the evidence as it stands, is suspension of judgment. And, on the necessity for even that suspension, reasonable men may differ, according to their views of probability.

Singular state of things! If I were to profess the doctrine which was held by "James, the brother of the Lord," and by every one of the "myriads" of his followers and co-religionists in Jerusalem up to twenty or thirty years after the crucifixion (and one knows not how much later at Pella), I should be condemned with unanimity as an ebionizing heretic by the Roman, Greek, and Protestant Churches! And, probably, this hearty and unanimous condemnation of the creed held by those who were in the closest personal relation with their Lord is almost the only point upon which they would be cordially of one mind. On the other hand—though I hardly dare imagine such a thing—I very much fear that the "pillars" of the primitive Hierosolymitan Church would have considered Dr. Wace an infidel. No one can read the famous second chapter of Galatians and the book of Revelation without seeing how narrow was even Paul's escape from a similar fate. And, if ecclesiastical history is to be trusted, the thirty-nine articles, be they right or wrong, diverge from the primitive doctrine of the Nazarenes vastly more than even Pauline Christianity did.

But, further than this, I have great difficulty in assuring myself that even James, "the brother of the Lord," and his "myriads" of Nazarenes, properly represented the doctrines of their Master. For it is constantly asserted by our modern "pillars" that one of the chief features of the work of Jesus was the instauration of religion by the abolition of what our sticklers for articles and liturgies, with unconscious humor, call the narrow restrictions of the law. Yet, if James knew this, how could the bitter controversy with Paul have arisen; and why did one or the other side not quote any of the various sayings of Jesus, recorded in the Gospels, which directly bear on the question—sometimes, apparently, in opposite directions?

So, if I am asked to call myself an "infidel," I reply, To what doctrine do you ask me to be faithful? Is it that contained in the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds? My firm belief is that the Nazarenes, say of the year 40, headed by James, would have stopped their ears and thought worthy of stoning the audacious man who propounded it to them. Is it contained in the so-called Apostles' Creed? I am pretty sure that even that would have created a recalcitrant commotion at Pella in the year 70, among the Nazarenes of Jerusalem, who had fled from the soldiers of Titus. And yet if the unadulterated tradition of the teachings of "the Nazarene" were to be found anywhere, it surely should have been amid those not very aged disciples who may have heard them as they were delivered.

Therefore, however sorry I may be to be unable to demonstrate that, if necessary, I should not be afraid to call myself an "infidel," I can not do it, even to gratify the Bishop of Peterborough and Dr. Wace. And I would appeal to the bishop, whose native sense of humor is not the least marked of his many excellent gifts and virtues, whether asking a man to call himself an "infidel" is not rather a droll request. "Infidel" is a term of reproach, which Christians and Mohammedans, in their modesty, agree to apply to those who differ from them. If he had only thought of it, Dr. Wace might have used the term "miscreant," which, with the same etymological signification, has the advantage of being still more "unpleasant" to the persons to whom it is applied. But, in the name of all that is Hibernian, I ask the Bishop of Peterborough why should a man be expected to call himself a "miscreant" or an "infidel"? That St. Patrick "had two birthdays because he was a twin" is a reasonable and intelligible utterance beside that of the man who should declare himself to be an infidel on the ground of denying his own belief. It may be logically, if not ethically, defensible, that a Christian should call a Mohammedan an infidel, and *vice versa*; but, on Dr. Wace's principles, both ought to call themselves infidels, because each applies that term to the other.

Now I am afraid that all the Mohammedan world would agree in reciprocating that appellation to Dr. Wace himself. I once visited the Hazar Mosque, the great university of Mohammedanism, in Cairo, in ignorance of the fact that I was unprovided with proper authority. A swarm of angry undergraduates, as I suppose I ought to call them, came buzzing about me and my guide; and, if I had known Arabic, I suspect that "dog of an infidel" would have been by no means the most "unpleasant" of the epithets showered upon me, before I could explain and apologize for the mistake.

If I had had the pleasure of Dr. Wace's company on that occasion, the undiscriminative followers of the Prophet would, I am afraid, have made no difference between us; not even if they had known that he was the head of an orthodox Christian seminary. And I have not the smallest doubt that even one of the learned mollahs, if his grave courtesy would have permitted him to say anything offensive to men of another mode of belief, would have told us that he wondered we did not find it "very unpleasant" to disbelieve in the Prophet of Islam.

From what precedes, I think it becomes sufficiently clear that Dr. Wace's account of the origin of the name of "Agnostic" is quite wrong. Indeed, I am bound to add that very slight effort to discover the truth would have convinced him that, as a matter of fact, the term arose otherwise. I am loath to go over an old story once more; but more than one object which I have in view will be served by telling it a little more fully than it has yet been told.

Looking back nearly fifty years, I see myself as a boy, whose education had been interrupted, and who, intellectually, was left, for some years, altogether to his own devices. At that time I was a voracious and omnivorous reader; a dreamer and speculator of the first water, well endowed with that splendid courage in attacking any and every subject which is the blessed compensation of youth and inexperience. Among the books and essays, on all sorts of topics from metaphysics to heraldry, which I read at this time, two left indelible impressions on my mind. One was Guizot's "History of Civilization," the other was Sir William Hamilton's essay "On the Philosophy of the Unconditioned," which I came upon, by chance, in an odd volume of the "Edinburgh Review." The latter was certainly strange reading for a boy, and I could not possibly have understood a great deal of it; * nevertheless, I devoured it with avidity, and it stamped upon my mind the strong conviction that, on even the most solemn and important of questions, men are apt to take cunning phrases for answers; and that the limitation of our faculties, in a great number of cases, renders real answers to such questions not merely actually impossible, but theoretically inconceivable.

Philosophy and history having laid hold of me in this eccentric fashion, have never loosened their grip. I have no pretension to be an expert in either subject; but the turn for philosophical and historical reading, which rendered Hamilton and Guizot attractive to me, has not only filled many lawful leisure hours, and still more sleepless ones, with the repose of changed mental occupation, but has not unfrequently disputed my proper work-time with my liege lady, Natural Science. In this way I have found it possible to cover a good deal of ground in the territory of philosophy; and all the more easily that I have never cared much about A's or B's opinions, but have rather sought to know what answer he had to give to the questions I had to put to him—that of the limitation of possible knowledge being the chief. The ordinary examiner, with his "State the views of So-and-so," would have floored me at any time. If he had said, "What do *you* think about any given problem?" I might have got on fairly well.

The reader who has had the patience to follow the enforced, but unwilling, egotism of this veritable history (especially if his studies have led him in the same direction), will now see why my mind steadily gravitated toward the conclusions of Hume and Kant, so well stated by the latter in a sentence, which I have quoted elsewhere:

"The greatest and perhaps the sole use of all philosophy of pure reason is, after all, merely negative, since it serves not as an organon for the enlargement [of knowledge], but as a discipline for its delimitation; and, instead of discovering truth, has only the modest merit of preventing error." *

When I reached intellectual maturity and began to ask myself whether I was an atheist, a theist, or a pantheist; a materialist or an idealist; a Christian or a free-thinker—I found that the more I learned and reflected, the less ready was the answer; until, at last, I came to the conclusion that I had neither art nor part with any of these denominations, except the last. The one thing in which most of these good people were agreed was the one thing in which I differed from them. They were quite sure they had attained a certain "gnosis"—had, more or less successfully, solved the problem of existence; while I was quite sure I had not, and had a pretty strong conviction that the problem was insoluble. And, with Hume and Kant on my side, I could not think myself presumptuous in holding fast by that opinion. Like Dante—

"Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita
Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura," †

---

* Yet I must somehow have laid hold of the pith of the matter, for, many years afterward, when Dean Mansel's Bampton lectures were published it seemed to me I already knew all that this eminently agnostic thinker had to tell me.

* "Kritik der reinen Vernunft." Edit. Hartenstein, p. 256.

† [In the midway of this our mortal life
I found me in a gloomy wood astray.]

but, unlike Dante, I can not add—

> "Che la diritta via era smarrita." *

On the contrary, I had, and have, the firmest conviction that I never left the "*verace via*"—the straight road; and that this road led nowhere else but into the dark depths of a wild and tangled forest. And though I have found leopards and lions in the path; though I have made abundant acquaintance with the hungry wolf, that with "privy paw devours apace and nothing said," as another great poet says of the ravening beast; and though no friendly specter has even yet offered his guidance, I was, and am, minded to go straight on, until I either come out on the other side of the wood, or find there is no other side to it—at least, none attainable by me.

This was my situation when I had the good fortune to find a place among the members of that remarkable confraternity of antagonists, long since deceased, but of green and pious memory, the Metaphysical Society. Every variety of philosophical and theological opinion was represented there, and expressed itself with entire openness; most of my colleagues were *ists* of one sort or another; and, however kind and friendly they might be, I, the man without a rag of a label to cover himself with, could not fail to have some of the uneasy feelings which must have beset the historical fox when, after leaving the trap in which his tail remained, he presented himself to his normally elongated companions. So I took thought, and invented what I conceived to be the appropriate title of "agnostic." It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the "gnostic" of Church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant; and I took the earliest opportunity of parading it at our society, to show that I, too, had a tail, like the other foxes. To my great satisfaction, the term took; and when the "Spectator" had stood godfather to it, any suspicion in the minds of respectable people, that a knowledge of its parentage might have awakened, was, of course, completely lulled.

That is the history of the origin of the terms "agnostic" and "agnosticism;" and it will be observed that it does not quite agree with the confident assertion of the reverend Principal of King's College, that "the adoption of the term agnostic is only an attempt to shift the issue, and that it involves a mere evasion" in relation to the Church and Christianity.†

The last objection (I rejoice, as much as my readers must do, that it is the last) which I have to take to Dr. Wace's deliverance before the Church Congress arises, I am sorry to say, on a question of morality.

"It is, and it ought to be," authoritatively declares this official representative of Christian ethics, "an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ" (*l. c.*, p. 254).

Whether it is so, depends, I imagine, a good deal on whether the man was brought up in a Christian household or not. I do not see why it should be "unpleasant" for a Mohammedan or a Buddhist to say so. But that "it ought to be" unpleasant for any man to say anything which he sincerely, and after due deliberation, believes, is, to my mind, a proposition of the most profoundly immoral character. I verily believe that the great good which has been effected in the world by Christianity has been largely counteracted by the pestilent doctrine on which all the churches have insisted, that honest disbelief in their more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offense, indeed a sin of the deepest dye, deserving and involving the same future retribution as murder and robbery. If we could only see, in one view, the torrents of hypocrisy and cruelty, the lies, the slaughter, the violations of every obligation of humanity, which have flowed from this source along the course of the history of Christian nations, our worst imaginations of hell would pale beside the vision.

A thousand times, no! It ought *not* to be unpleasant to say that which one honestly believes or disbelieves. That it so constantly is painful to do so, is quite enough obstacle to the progress of mankind in that most valuable of all qualities, honesty of word or of deed, without erecting a sad concomitant of human weakness into something to be admired and cherished. The bravest of soldiers often, and very naturally, "feel it unpleasant" to go into action; but a court-martial which did its duty would make short work of the officer who promulgated the doctrine that his men *ought* to feel their duty unpleasant.

I am very well aware, as I suppose most thoughtful people are in these times, that the process of breaking away from old beliefs is extremely unpleasant; and I am much disposed to think that the encouragement, the consolation, and the peace afforded to earnest believers in even the worst forms of Christianity are of great practical advantage to them. What deductions must be made from this gain on the score of the harm done to the citizen by the ascetic other-worldliness of logical Christianity; to the ruler, by the hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness of sectarian bigotry; to the legislator, by the spirit of exclusiveness and domination of those that count themselves pillars of orthodoxy; to the philosopher, by the restraints on the freedom of learning and teaching which every church exercises, when it is strong enough; to the conscientious soul, by the introspective hunting after sins of the mint and cummin type, the fear of theological error, and the overpowering terror of possible damnation, which have accompanied the churches like their shadow, I need not now consider; but they are assuredly not small. If agnostics lose heavily on the one side, they gain a good deal on the other. People who talk about the comforts of belief appear to forget its discomforts; they ignore the fact that the Christianity of the churches is something more than faith in the ideal personality of Jesus, which they create for themselves, *plus* so much as can be carried into practice, without disorganizing civil society, of the maxims of the Sermon on the Mount. Trip in morals or in doctrine (especially in doctrine), without due repentance or retractation, or fail to get properly baptized before you die, and a *plêbiscite* of the Christians of Europe, if they were true to their creeds, would affirm your everlasting damnation by an immense majority.

---

* [Gone from the path direct.]

† Page 43.

Preachers, orthodox and heterodox, din into our ears that the world can not get on without faith of some sort. There is a sense in which that is as eminently as obviously true; there is another, in which, in my judgment, it is as eminently as obviously false, and it seems to me that the hortatory, or pulpit, mind is apt to oscillate between the false and the true meanings, without being aware of the fact.

It is quite true that the ground of every one of our actions, and the validity of all our reasonings, rest upon the great act of faith, which leads us to take the experience of the past as a safe guide in our dealings with the present and the future. From the nature of ratiocination it is obvious that the axioms on which it is based can not be demonstrated by ratiocination. It is also a trite observation that, in the business of life, we constantly take the most serious action upon evidence of an utterly insufficient character. But it is surely plain that faith is not necessarily entitled to dispense with ratiocination because ratiocination can not dispense with faith as a starting-point; and that because we are often obliged, by the pressure of events, to act on very bad evidence, it does not follow that it is proper to act on such evidence when the pressure is absent.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews tells us that "faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen." In the authorized version "substance" stands for "assurance," and "evidence" for "the proving." The question of the exact meaning of the two words, *ὑπόστασις* and *ἔλεγχος*, affords a fine field of discussion for the scholar and the metaphysician. But I fancy we shall be not far from the mark if we take the writer to have had in his mind the profound psychological truth that men constantly feel certain about things for which they strongly hope, but have no evidence, in the legal or logical sense of the word; and he calls this feeling "faith." I may have the most absolute faith that a friend has not committed the crime of which he is accused. In the early days of English history, if my friend could have obtained a few more compurgators of like robust faith, he would have been acquitted. At the present day, if I tendered myself as a witness on that score, the judge would tell me to stand down, and the youngest barrister would smile at my simplicity. Miserable indeed is the man who has not such faith in some of his fellow-men—only less miserable than the man who allows himself to forget that such faith is not, strictly speaking, evidence; and when his faith is disappointed, as will happen now and again, turns Timon and blames the universe for his own blunders. And so, if a man can find a friend, the hypostasis of all his hopes, the mirror of his ethical ideal, in the Jesus of any, or all, of the Gospels, let him live by faith in that ideal. Who shall or can forbid him? But let him not delude himself with the notion that his faith is evidence of the objective reality of that in which he trusts. Such evidence is to be obtained only by the use of the methods of science, as applied to history and to literature, and it amounts at present to very little.

It appears that Mr. Gladstone, some time ago, asked Mr. Laing if he could draw up a short summary of the negative creed; a body of negative propositions, which have so far been adopted on the negative side as to be what the Apostles' and other accepted creeds are on the positive; and Mr. Laing at once kindly obliged Mr. Gladstone with the desired articles—eight of them.

If any one had preferred this request to me, I should have replied that, if he referred to agnostics, they have no creed; and, by the nature of the case, can not have any.

Agnosticism, in fact, is not a creed, but a method, the essence of which lies in the rigorous application of a single principle. That principle is of great antiquity; it is as old as Socrates; as old as the writer who said, "Try all things, hold fast by that which is good"; it is the foundation of the Reformation, which simply illustrated the axiom that every man should be able to give a reason for the faith that is in him; it is the great principle of Descartes; it is the fundamental axiom of modern science. Positively the principle may be expressed: In matters of the intellect, follow your reason as far as it will take you, without regard to any other consideration. And negatively: In matters of the intellect, do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable. That I take to be the agnostic faith, which if a man keep whole and undefiled, he shall not be ashamed to look the universe in the face, whatever the future may have in store for him.

The results of the working out of the agnostic principle will vary according to individual knowledge and capacity, and according to the general condition of science. That which is unproved to-day may be proved, by the help of new discoveries, to-morrow. The only negative fixed points will be those negations which flow from the demonstrable limitation of our faculties. And the only obligation accepted is to have the mind always open to conviction. Agnostics who never fail in carrying out their principles are, I am afraid, as rare as other people of whom the same consistency can be truthfully predicated. But, if you were to meet with such a phœnix and to tell him that you had discovered that two and two make five, he would patiently ask you to state your reasons for that conviction, and express his readiness to agree with you if he found them satisfactory. The apostolic injunction to "suffer fools gladly," should be the rule of life of a true agnostic. I am deeply conscious how far I myself fall short of this ideal, but it is my personal conception of what agnostics ought to be.

However, as I began by stating, I speak only for myself; and I do not dream of anathematizing and excommunicating Mr. Laing. But, when I consider his creed and compare it with the Athanasian, I think I have, on the whole, a clearer conception of the meaning of the latter. "Polarity," in Article viii, for example, is a word about which I heard a good deal in my youth, when "Naturphilosophie" was in fashion, and greatly did I suffer from it. For many years past, whenever I have met with "polarity" anywhere but in a discussion of some purely physical topic, such as magnetism, I have shut the book. Mr. Laing must excuse me if the force of habit was too much for me when I read his eighth article.

And now, what is to be said to Mr. Harrison's remarkable deliverance "On the future of agnosticism"?* I would that it were not my business to say anything, for I am afraid that I can say nothing which shall manifest my great personal respect for this able writer, and for the zeal and energy with which he ever and anon galvanizes the weakly frame of positivism until it looks more than ever like John Bunyan's Pope and Pagan rolled into one. There is a story often repeated, and I am afraid none the less mythical on that account, of a valiant and loud-voiced corporal, in command of two full privates, who, falling in with a regiment of the enemy in the dark, orders it to surrender under pain of instant annihilation by his force; and the enemy surrenders accordingly. I am always reminded of this tale when I read the positivist commands to the forces of Christianity and of Science; only the enemy show no more signs of intending to obey now than they have done any time these forty years.

The allocution under consideration has the papal flavor which is wont to hang about the utterances of the pontiffs of the Church of Comte. Mr. Harrison speaks with authority, and not as one of the common scribes of the period. He knows not only what agnosticism is and how it has come about, but what will become of it. The agnostic is to content himself with being the precursor of the positivist. In his place, as a sort of navvy leveling the ground and cleansing it of such poor stuff as Christianity, he is a useful creature who deserves patting on the back, on condition that he does not venture beyond his last. But let not these scientific Sanballats presume that they are good enough to take part in the building of the temple—they are mere Samaritans, doomed to die out in proportion as the Religion of Humanity is accepted by mankind. Well, if that is their fate, they have time to be cheerful. But let us hear Mr. Harrison's pronouncement of their doom:

"Agnosticism is a stage in the evolution of religion, an entirely negative stage, the point reached by physicists, a purely mental conclusion, with no relation to things social at all" (p. 154). I am quite dazed by this declaration. Are there, then, any "conclusions" that are not "purely mental"? Is there "no relation to things social" in "mental conclusions" which affect men's whole conception of life? Was that prince of agnostics, David Hume, particularly imbued with physical science? Supposing physical science to be non-existent, would not the agnostic principle, applied by the philologist and the historian, lead to exactly the same results? Is the modern more or less complete suspension of judgment as to the facts of the history of regal Rome, or the real origin of the Homeric poems, anything but agnosticism in history and in literature? And if so, how can agnosticism be the "mere negation of the physicist"?

---

* "Fortnightly Review," January, 1889.

"Agnosticism is a stage in the evolution of religion." No two people agree as to what is meant by the term "religion"; but if it means, as I think it ought to mean, simply the reverence and love for the ethical ideal, and the desire to realize that ideal in life, which every man ought to feel—then I say agnosticism has no more to do with it than it has to do with music or painting. If, on the other hand, Mr. Harrison, like most people, means by "religion" theology, then, in my judgment, agnosticism can be said to be a stage in its evolution, only as death may be said to be the final stage in the evolution of life.

> When agnostic logic is simply one of the canons of thought, agnosticism, as a distinctive faith, will have spontaneously disappeared (p. 155).

I can but marvel that such sentences as this, and those already quoted, should have proceeded from Mr. Harrison's pen. Does he really mean to suggest that agnostics have a logic peculiar to themselves? Will he kindly help me out of my bewilderment when I try to think of "logic" being anything else than the canon (which, I believe, means rule) of thought? As to agnosticism being a distinctive faith, I have already shown that it cannot possibly be anything of the kind; unless perfect faith in logic is distinctive of agnostics, which, after all, it may be.

> Agnosticism as a religious philosophy *per se* rests on an almost total ignoring of history and social evolution (p. 152).

But neither *per se* nor *per aliud* has agnosticism (if I know anything about it) the least pretension to be a religious philosophy; so far from resting on ignorance of history, and that social evolution of which history is the account, it is and has been the inevitable result of the strict adherence to scientific methods by historical investigators. Our forefathers were quite confident about the existence of Romulus and Remus, of King Arthur, and of Hengist and Horsa. Most of us have become agnostics in regard to the reality of these worthies. It is a matter of notoriety, of which Mr. Harrison, who accuses us all so freely of ignoring history, should not be ignorant, that the critical process which has shattered the foundations of orthodox Christian doctrine owes its origin, not to the devotees of physical science, but, before all, to Richard Simon, the learned French Oratorian, just two hundred years ago. I cannot find evidence that either Simon, or any one of the great scholars and critics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who have continued Simon's work, had any particular acquaintance with physical science. I have already pointed out that Hume was independent of it. And certainly one of the most potent influences in the same direction, upon history in the present century, that of Grote, did not come from the physical side. Physical science, in fact, has had nothing directly to do with the criticism of the Gospels; it is wholly incompetent to furnish demonstrative evidence that any statement made in these histories is untrue. Indeed, modern physiology can find parallels in nature for events of apparently the most eminently supernatural kind recounted in some of those histories.

It is a comfort to hear, upon Mr. Harrison's authority, that the laws of physical nature show no signs of becoming "less definite, less consistent, or less popular as time goes on" (p. 154). How a law of nature is to become indefinite, or "inconsistent," passes my poor powers of imagination. But with universal suffrage and the coach-dog theory of premiership in full view; the theory, I mean, that the whole duty of a political chief is to look sharp for the way the social coach is driving, and then run in front and bark loud—as if being the leading noisemaker and guiding were the same things—it is truly satisfactory to me to know that the laws of nature are increasing in popularity. Looking at recent developments of the policy which is said to express the great heart of the people, I have had my doubts of the fact; and my love for my fellow-countrymen has led me to reflect with dread on what will happen to them, if any of the laws of nature ever become so unpopular in their eyes as to be voted down by the transcendent authority of universal suffrage. If the legion of demons, before they set out on their journey in the swine, had had time to hold a meeting and to resolve unanimously, "That the law of gravitation is oppressive and ought to be repealed," I am afraid it would have made no sort of difference to the result, when their two thousand unwilling porters were once launched down the steep slopes of the fatal shore of Gennesaret.

> The question of the place of religion as an element of human nature, as a force of human society, its origin, analysis, and functions, has never been considered at all from an agnostic point of view (p. 152).

I doubt not that Mr. Harrison knows vastly more about history than I do; in fact, he tells the public that some of my friends and I have had no opportunity of occupying ourselves with that subject. I do not like to contradict any statement which Mr. Harrison makes on his own authority; only, if I may be true to my agnostic principles, I humbly ask how he has obtained assurance on this head. I do not profess to know anything about the range of Mr. Harrison's studies; but as he has thought it fitting to start the subject, I may venture to point out that, on the evidence adduced, it might be equally permissible to draw the conclusion that Mr. Harrison's absorbing labors as the *pontifex maximus* of the positivist religion have not allowed him to acquire that acquaintance with the methods and results of physical science, or with the history of philosophy, or of philological and historical criticism, which is essential to any one who desires to obtain a right understanding of agnosticism. Incompetence in philosophy, and in all branches of science except mathematics, is the well-known mental characteristic of the founder of Positivism. Faithfulness in disciples is an admirable quality in itself; the pity is that it not unfrequently leads to the imitation of the weaknesses as well as of the strength of the master. It is only such over-faithfulness which can account for a "strong mind really saturated with the historical sense" (p. 153) exhibiting the extraordinary forgetfulness of the historical fact of the existence of David Hume implied by the assertion that

> it would be difficult to name a single known agnostic who has given to history anything like the amount of thought and study which he brings to a knowledge of the physical world (p. 153).

Whoso calls to mind, what I may venture to term, the bright side of Christianity; that ideal of manhood, with its strength and its patience; its justice and its pity for human frailty; its helpfulness, to the extremity of self-sacrifice; its ethical purity and nobility; which apostles have pictured, in which armies of martyrs have placed their unshakable faith, and whence obscure men and women, like Catherine of Sienna and John Knox, have derived the courage to rebuke popes and kings, is not likely to underrate the importance of the Christian faith as a factor in human history, or to doubt that if that faith should prove to be incompatible with our knowledge, or necessary want of knowledge, some other hypostasis of men's hopes, genuine enough and worthy enough to replace it, will arise. But that the incongruous mixture of bad science with eviscerated papistry, out of which Comte manufactured the positivist religion, will be the heir of the Christian ages, I have too much respect for the humanity of the future to believe. Charles II. told his brother, "They will not kill me, James, to make you king." And if critical science is remorselessly destroying the historical foundations of the noblest ideal of humanity which mankind have yet worshipped, it is little likely to permit the pitiful reality to climb into the vacant shrine.

That a man should determine to devote himself to the service of humanity—including intellectual and moral self-culture under that name; that this should be, in the proper sense of the word, his religion—is not only an intelligible, but, I think, a laudable resolution. And I am greatly disposed to believe that it is the only religion which will prove itself to be unassailably acceptable so long as the human race endures. But when the positivist asks me to worship "Humanity"—that is to say, to adore the generalized conception of men as they ever have been and probably ever will be—I must reply that I could just as soon bow down and worship the generalized conception of a "wilderness of apes." Surely we are not going back to the days of paganism, when individual men were deified, and the hard good sense of a dying Vespasian could prompt the bitter jest, "*Ut puto Deus fio.*" No divinity doth hedge a modern man, be he even a sovereign ruler. Nor is there any one, except a municipal magistrate, who is officially declared worshipful. But if there is no spark of worship-worthy divinity in the individual twigs of humanity, whence comes that godlike splendor which the Moses of positivism fondly imagines to pervade the whole bush?

I know no study which is so unutterably saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history. Out of the darkness of prehistoric ages man emerges with the marks of his lowly origin strong upon him. He is a brute, only more intelligent than the other brutes; a blind prey to impulses, which as often as not lead him to destruction ; a victim to endless illusions, which make his mental existence a terror and a burden, and fill his physical life with barren toil and battle. He attains a certain degree of physical comfort, and develops a more or less workable theory of life, in such favorable situations as the plains of Mesopotamia or of Egypt, and then, for thousands and thousands of years, struggles with varying fortunes, attended by infinite wickedness, bloodshed, and misery, to maintain himself at this point against the greed and the ambition of his fellow-men. He makes a point of killing and otherwise persecuting all those who first try to get him to move on ; and when he has moved on a step, foolishly confers *post-mortem* deification on his victims. He exactly repeats the process with all who want to move a step yet farther. And the best men of the best epochs are simply those who make the fewest blunders and commit the fewest sins.

That one should rejoice in the good man ; forgive the bad man ; and pity and help all men to the best of one's ability, is surely indisputable. It is the glory of Judaism and of Christianity to have proclaimed this truth, through all their aberrations. But the worship of a God who needs forgiveness and help, and deserves pity every hour of his existence, is no better than that of any other voluntarily selected fetich. The Emperor Julian's project was hopeful, in comparison with the prospects of the new anthropolatry.

When the historian of religion in the twentieth century is writing about the nineteenth, I foresee he will say something of this kind :

The most curious and instructive events in the religious history of the preceding century are the rise and progress of two new sects, called Mormons and Positivists. To the student who has carefully considered these remarkable phenomena nothing in the records of religious self-delusion can appear improbable.

The Mormons arose in the midst of the great Republic, which, though comparatively insignificant at that time, in territory as in the number of its citizens, was (as we know from the fragments of the speeches of its orators which have come down to us) no less remarkable for the native intelligence of its population, than for the wide extent of their information, owing to the activity of their publishers in diffusing all that they could invent, beg, borrow, or steal. Nor were they less noted for their perfect freedom from all restraints in thought or speech or deed ; except, to be sure, the beneficent and wise influence of the majority exerted, in case of need, through an institution known as "tarring and feathering," the exact nature of which is now disputed.

There is a complete consensus of testimony that the founder of Mormonism, one Joseph Smith, was a low-minded, ignorant scamp, and that he stole the "Scriptures" which he propounded ; not being clever enough to forge even such contemptible stuff as they contain. Nevertheless he must have been a man of some force of character, for a considerable number of disciples soon gathered about him. In spite of repeated outbursts of popular hatred and violence—during one of which persecutions, Smith was brutally murdered—the Mormon body steadily increased, and became a flourishing community. But the Mormon practices being objectionable to the majority, they were, more than once, without any pretence of law, but by force of riot, arson, and murder, driven away from the land they had occupied. Harried by these persecutions, the Mormon body eventually committed itself to the tender mercies of a desert as barren as that of Sinai ; and, after terrible sufferings and privations, reached the oasis of Utah. Here it grew and flourished, sending out missionaries to, and receiving converts from, all parts of Europe, sometimes to the number of 10,000 in a year ; until in 1880, the rich and flourishing community numbered 110,000 souls in Utah alone, while there were probably 30,000 or 40,000 scattered abroad elsewhere. In the whole history of religions there is no more remarkable example of the power of faith ; and, in this case, the founder of that faith was indubitably a most despicable creature. It is interesting to observe that the course taken by the great Republic and its citizens runs exactly parallel with that taken by the Roman Empire and its citizens toward the early Christians, except that the Romans had a certain legal excuse for their acts of violence, inasmuch as the Christian "sodalitia" were not licensed, and consequently were, *ipso facto,* illegal assemblages. Until, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the United States Legislature decreed the illegality of polygamy, the Mormons were wholly within the law.

Nothing can present a greater contrast to all this than the history of the Positivists. This sect arose much about the same time as that of the Mormons, in the upper and most instructed stratum of the quick-witted, sceptical population of Paris. The founder, Auguste Comte, was a teacher of mathematics, but of no eminence in that department of knowledge, and with nothing but an amateur's acquaintance with physical, chemical, and biological science. His works are repulsive on account of the dull diffuseness of their style, and a certain air, as of a superior person, which characterizes them; but, nevertheless, they contain good things here and there. It would take too much space to reproduce in detail a system which proposes to regulate all human life by the promulgation of a gentile Leviticus. Suffice it to say that M. Comte may be described as a syncretic, who, like the gnostics of early Church history, attempted to combine the substance of imperfectly comprehended contemporary science with the form of Roman Christianity. It may be that this is the reason why his disciples were so very angry with some obscure people called Agnostics, whose views, if we may judge by the accounts left in the works of a great positivist controversial writer, were very absurd.

To put the matter briefly, M. Comte, finding Christianity and Science at daggers drawn, seems to have said to Science: "You find Christianity rotten at the core, do you? Well, I will scoop out the inside of it." And to Romanism: "You find Science mere dry light—cold and bare. Well, I will put your shell over it, and so, as schoolboys make a spectre out of a turnip and a tallow candle, behold the new religion of Humanity complete!"

Unfortunately, neither the Romanists nor the people who were something more than amateurs in science could be got to worship M. Comte's new idol properly. In the native country of Positivism, one distinguished man of letters and one of science, for a time, helped to make up a roomful of the faithful, but their love soon grew cold. In England, on the other hand, there appears to be little doubt that, in the ninth decade of the century, the multitude of disciples reached the grand total of several score. They had the advantage of the advocacy of one or two most eloquent and learned apostles, and, at any rate, the sympathy of several persons of light and leading—and, if they were not seen, they were heard all over the world. On the other hand, as a sect, they labored under the prodigious disadvantage of being refined, estimable people, living in the midst of the worn-out civilization of the Old World, where any one who had tried to persecute them, as the Mormons were persecuted, would have been instantly hanged. But the majority never dreamed of persecuting them; on the contrary, they were rather given to scold, and otherwise try the patience of the majority.

The history of these sects in the closing years of the century is highly instructive. Mormonism. . . .

But I find I have suddenly slipped off Mr. Harrison's tripod, which I had borrowed for the occasion. The fact is, I am not equal to the prophetical business, and ought not to have undertaken it.

III.

AGNOSTICISM.

A Reply to Professor Huxley.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.

It would hardly be reasonable to complain of Professor Huxley's delay in replying to the paper on "Agnosticism" which I read five months ago, when, at the urgent request of an old friend, I reluctantly consented to address the Church Congress at Manchester. I am obliged to him for doing it the honor to bring it to the notice of a wider circle than that to which it was directly addressed; and I fear that, for reasons which have been the occasion of universal regret, he may not have been equal to literary effort. But, at the same time, it is impossible not to notice that a writer is at a great advantage in attacking a fugitive essay a quarter of a year after it was made public. Such a lapse of time ought, indeed, to enable him to apprehend distinctly the argument with which he is dealing; and it might, at least, secure him from any such inaccuracy in quotation as greater haste might excuse. But if either his idiosyncrasy, or his sense of assured superiority, should lead him to pay no real attention to the argument he is attacking, or should betray him into material misquotation, he may at least be sure that scarcely any of his readers will care to refer to the original paper, or will have the opportunity of doing so. I can scarcely hope that Professor Huxley's obliging reference to the "Official Report of the Church Congress" will induce many of those who are influenced by his answer to my paper to purchase that interesting volume, though they would be well repaid by some of its other contents; and I can hardly rely on their spending even twopence upon the reprint of the paper, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

I have therefore felt obliged to ask the editor of this review to be kind enough to admit to his pages a brief restatement of the position which Professor Huxley has assailed, with such notice of his arguments as is practicable within the comparatively brief space which can be afforded me. I could not, indeed, amid the pressing claims of a college like this in term time, besides the chairmanship of a hospital, a preachership, and other duties, attempt any reply which would deal as thoroughly as could be wished with an article of so much skill and finish. But it is a matter of justice to my cause and to myself to remove at once the unscientific and prejudiced representation of the case which Professor Huxley has put forward; and fortunately there will be need of no elaborate argument for this purpose. There is no occasion to go beyond Professor Huxley's own article and the language of my paper to exhibit his entire misapprehension of the point in dispute; while I am much more than content to rely for the invalidation of his own contentions upon the authorities he himself quotes.

What, then, is the position with which Professor Huxley finds fault? He is good enough to say that what he calls my "description" of an agnostic may for the present pass, so that we are so far, at starting, on common ground. The actual description of an agnostic, which is given in my paper, is indeed distinct from the words he quotes, and is taken from an authoritative source. But what I have said is that, as an escape from such an article of Christian belief as that we have a Father in heaven, or that Jesus Christ is the Judge of quick and dead, and will hereafter return to judge the world, an agnostic urges that "he has no means of a scientific knowledge of the unseen world or of the future;" and I maintain that this plea is irrelevant. Christians do not presume to say that they have a scientific knowledge of such articles of their creed. They say that they believe them, and they believe them mainly on the assurances of Jesus Christ. Consequently their characteristic difference from an agnostic consists in the fact that they believe those assurances, and that he does not. Professor Huxley's observation, "Are there then any Christians who say that they know nothing about the unseen world and the future? I was ignorant of the fact, but I am ready to accept it on the authority of a professed theologian," is either a quibble, or one of many indications that he does not recognize the point at issue. I am speaking, as the sentence shows, of scientific knowledge—knowledge which can be obtained by our own reason and observation alone—and no one with Professor Huxley's learning is justified in being ignorant that it is not upon such knowledge, but upon supernatural revelation, that Christian belief rests. However, as he goes on to say, my view of "the real state of the case is that the agnostic 'does not believe the authority' on which 'these things' are stated, which authority is Jesus Christ. He is simply an old-fashioned 'infidel' who is afraid to own to his right name." The argument has nothing to do with his motive, whether it is being afraid or not. It only concerns the fact that that by which he is distinctively separated from the Christian is that he does not believe the assurances of Jesus Christ.

Professor Huxley thinks there is "an attractive simplicity about this solution of the problem"—he means, of course, this statement of the case—"and it has that advantage of being somewhat offensive to the persons attacked, which is so dear to the less refined sort of controversialist." I think Professor Huxley must have forgotten himself and his own feelings in this observation. There can be no question, of course, of his belonging himself to the more refined sort of controversialist; but he has a characteristic fancy for solutions of problems, or statements of cases, which have the "advantage of being somewhat offensive to the persons attacked." Without taking this particular phrase into account, it certainly has "the advantage of being offensive to the persons attacked" that Professor Huxley should speak in this article of "the pestilent doctrine on which all the churches have insisted, the honest disbelief"—the word honest is not a misquotation—"honest disbelief in their more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offence, indeed a sin of the deepest dye, deserving and involving the same future retribution as murder or robbery," or that he should say, "Trip in morals or in doctrine (especially in doctrine), without due repentance or retractation, or fail to get properly baptized before you die, and a *plêbiscite* of the Christians of Europe, if they were true to their creeds, would affirm your everlasting damnation by an immense majority." We have fortunately nothing to do in this argument with *plêbiscites;* and as statements of authoritative Christian teaching, the least that can be said of these allegations is that they are offensive exaggerations.

(To be continued.)

GOODLY WORDS.

Original translations from MEISTER ECKART, by C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

(Martensen, page xvii.*) When I speak, I am accustomed to speak about (1) abandonment of the world, and that man is to be liberated from self and the things of the world ; (2) how we ought to be conformed to the Simple Good, which is God ; (3) that one ought to consider the nobility of the soul, given by God ; (4) about the unspeakable purity and clearness of the Divine nature.

(Mart. xvii.) What is Eternity ? Eternity is an ever-present *now*, which knows nothing of time. The day passed a thousand years ago is no further from Eternity than this present hour ; and the day which is to come in a thousand years is no further from Eternity than this hour in which I am preaching.

(Mart. xvii.) Everything rests only in its spring. If you throw a stone up into the air it rests not, it falls again to the ground. Why so ? The ground is its resting-place, it is not at home in the air. The spring from which I am come forth is the Deity. The Deity is my native country. Have I my father in the Deity ? Yea, not only my father have I there, but myself too. Before I existed (before I became I), I rested in the Deity.

(Mart. xviii.) The nearer a thing is to its spring, the younger it is. The farther it is from its spring, the older it is. The nearer the soul is to God, the younger she is. In reasonableness one is always young, and the more truly one stands in reasonableness, the nearer one is to the spring. That which I am according to time, that perishes in time, and goes to nought ; but according to my birth, which is eternal, I shall never die. Know this : the child in the womb is old enough to die, but I will mourn if I am not younger to-morrow than I am to-day.

(Mart. xviii.) In the fullness of time God sends His Son in the soul. What is the fullness of time ? It is come when time is no more. He who, still being in time, has set his heart in eternity, in him is the fullness of time. When the soul is liberated from time and space, then God sends His Son in the soul.

(Mart. xix.) None is good, but One, God. What is Good ? That which is most universal and communicates itself to everything else. He is a good man who is useful and has something to communicate to others. God is the most universal of all beings : He communicates Himself to all things. No thing gives itself. The Sun gives its light only, but remains in itself as before. But God gives Himself in all His gifts. If He did not give Himself He would not be God.

In all things something of God is to be found, but in the soul God is *personally* present.

(Mart. xix.) If you seek God for His sake alone, then you shall find Him and the whole world besides.

(Mart. xix.) Plain people often believe that they ought to think of God as if He stood here or there. It is not so. God and I are one in Understanding. God's essence is Understanding, and God's Understanding makes me know Him. Therefore is His Understanding my Understanding.

(Mart. xx.) Every going out is for the sake of the going in. Every Beginning is for the sake of the End. God does not rest where He is only a Beginning, but where He is the End of all being. (Not as if these beings were annihilated ; they are perfected !)

What is the last End ? It is the hidden darkness of the eternal Godhead. It is unknown and is never to be known.

(Mart. xx.) Do you ask me to tell you what God intended when He created all things ? I answer : Rest ! Again, do you ask me what all creation longs for according to its nature ? I answer : Rest ! Again, do you ask me what the soul is seeking ? I answer : Rest ! . . . In the pure soul God finds Rest, and that soul rests in God. In the same degree as God rests in the soul, that soul rests in God. If the soul rests but partially in God, God rests but partially in it. If you refuse to let God rest in your soul, you rob Him of His Godhead.

(Mart. xx.) God begins where Nature ends. God asks no more of you than that you go out of yourself, that God may be God in you. The least created image that possesses your soul becomes as large as God. Why ? It robs you of an entire God. When the image enters, God must give way. When the image makes its exit, God enters anew. So much does God love your salvation that His own blessedness is dependent upon it, as it were. Oh man ! can it hurt you that you allow God to be God in you ?

(Mart. xx.) People often say to me : " Pray God for me." Then I think with myself : " Why go ye out ? Why abide ye not in your own selves, and lay hold on the good in your own possession ? Ye have all truth essentially within you."

(Mart. xxi.) All the creature longs to become like unto God. If God were not in all things, Nature would know of neither activity nor longing. Nature longs secretly for God. Consciously or unconsciously, for or against, Nature turns to God alone in all her endeavors. If a man were ever so thirsty, he could not desire a drink if something of God were not in it.

(Mart. xxi.) God loves Nothing but Himself ; He consumes all His love in Himself. No one needs be alarmed because I said that God loves Himself only. It is the very best for us, and our salvation depends upon it.

(Mart. xxi.) God loves Himself, His nature, His being, and His Godhead. With the same love as God loves Himself, He loves all the creature, but not as the creature, but as the creature like God. Now, I ask you to listen ; I will speak as I never spoke before : God tastes Himself, and as He tastes Himself He tastes all the creature, not as the creature, but as the creature like God.

(Mart. xxi.) My outer man tastes all the created things as created things—wine as wine, bread as bread. My inner man tastes everything as the gift of God. But in all gifts God gives Himself.

(Mart. xxii.) It is an undoubted truth that it is necessary for God to seek us ; yea, His Godhead depends upon it. God can no more be without us than we without Him. If we should turn from God, He could not turn from us. Therefore I will not ask Him for anything, nor will I thank Him for anything He has already given me ; but I will ask that He will make me worthy to receive Him, and I will praise Him, because His nature is so that He *must* give good gifts.

(Mart. xxii.) By Truth, The Good, Eternal, and Everlasting, I declare that to every man who hath utterly abandoned self, God communicates Himself according to all His power, so entirely that He retains nothing in His life and in His essence, in His nature and in His Godhead ; He *must* pour Himself out in a fruitful (fruit-bearing) way.

---

* The translations are made from the texts given in (Prof. Theol.) Dr. H. Martensen's *Meister Eckart*. Eine theologische Studie. Hamburg, 1842. Now out of print and scarce. All translations have been compared with the author's original Danish work and the later text editions of Eckart.

PARAGRAPHIC.

There are more Jews in New York City than there are in Jerusalem, the number being about 90,000.

A Hebrew Bible in the Vatican is said to be the most valuable book in the world. It weighs more than 320 pounds, and its weight in gold, or $125,000, has been refused for it, when gold was worth three times what it is now. This was in the days of Pope Julius or in 1512.

The *Christian at Work* says:
"There are those who spell denominationalism with a big D and Gospel with a little g."

There is unspeakable significance in the words of the aged and wicked man who said: "I am not afraid to die, but *I am afraid to be dead*."—*Zion's Herald.*

Force of Habit.—Clerical-looking personage enters the restaurant.
Waiter: "What will you have, sir?"
Rev.: "Steak, please."
Waiter: "How will you have it?"
Rev., absent-mindedly: "Well done, thou good and faith—ahem!"—*From Lippincott's.*

The *Congregationalist* says: "It is not essential to the highest success that a man should always have a crowd to hear him. The deeper question is, What impression does the preacher make on those who do hear him? Do his words influence their thought and conduct? Do they produce character? It may be that the man who carries his hearers with him, even if they are few, accomplishes more in the course of years than the man who always speaks to a crowd."

We learn on the authority of the Hon. John Jay, that "Webster denounced the 'infidel argument' that the great religious truths believed by all Christians, the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the divine authority of the New Testament could not be taught without sectarianism," and President Dwight of the Columbia College Law School says, that it was "well settled by the decisions of the leading States of the Union that Christianity is a part of the common law of the State."

It was at the last session of the Southern Illinois Conference. Recommendations for local deacons and elders' orders were under consideration, and the bishop put the question to a candidate whose case was under consideration: "Will you *wholly* abstain from the use of tobacco?" There was a moment's hesitation, which gained the attention of the conference, when the answer came: "Bishop, I don't use it for smoking or for chewing, but—but—I want to continue the use of it for *horse medicine*." For a few moments the laughter was irrepressible.—*Central Christian Advocate.*

Laborer and Loafer.—Home returneth the good pastor from an earned vacation in Europe, joyously greeting his native land. To him the elder, far better than the pastor, comes with fervent greeting for his welcome home. Shaking his head sadly, he says, with earnestness that far outstrips his originality, "Ah, parson, the devil never takes a vacation."

"No, indeed," the parson replies, with unexpected outburst of genuine heartiness, "he doesn't need one; he never works hard enough. If he should take my contract to drag this congregation up-hill to heaven, instead of merely amusing himself by dancing with it on the primrose grade, he'd want a vacation every six weeks, and then he'd break down before the year was out."—*Robert J. Burdette, in Lippincott's Magazine for November.*

The origin of the familiar Sunday-school hymn,

There is a happy land
Far, far away,

has lately been explained in the columns of the New York *Tribune.* It was composed in 1838 by Andrew Young, a man now eighty years of age, a lover both of music and of children. The tune is an old Indian air, whose melody struck Mr. Young's musical ear and haunted him until he was able to write out suitable words for an accompaniment. He sang the hymn in the presence of an intimate friend, who was a publisher, and it got into print at once, and has been translated into nineteen different languages. It is said that Thackeray once burst into tears on hearing it sung in the slums of London by a crowd of poor, ragged children sitting on the pavement. The contrast between their squalid surroundings and the ideas suggested by the words of the hymn was too much for his tender heart.—*The Congregationalist.*

JUST DO YOUR BEST.

BY JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY.

The signs is bad when folks commence
A-findin' fault with Providence,
And balkin' 'cause the earth don't shake
At ev'ry prancin' step they take.
No man is great till he can see
How less than little he would be
Ef stripped to self, and stark and bare,
He hung his sign out anywhere.

My doctern is to lay aside
Contentions, and be satisfied;
Jest do your best, and praise er blame
That follers that counts jest the same.
I've allus noticed great success
Is mixed with troubles, more or less,
And it's the man who does the best
That gits more kicks than all the rest.

—[Selected.
—*Christian Union, N. Y.*

Zeal in Church work cannot compensate for a personal surrender to Christ and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. And on the other hand, it may be affirmed as surely that liberal giving does not relieve one from attendance on the common means of grace and Church work. The one is fully as much out of the way as the other. What God asks of us is first ourselves and then our treasure and our talents, and the last are acceptable on account of the gift of ourselves. God cannot be satisfied with less than the consecration of ourselves and all we have and the employment of ourselves and all we have in his service. Christ willingly accepts the one talent, but he will not accept less than all of the five or ten talents with which he has endowed others. If one withholds anything at all it is an inefficient and unprofitable service that he offers. And all half service, however sincere, fails to bring the full enjoyment for which the soul pines. There are those whose zeal and liberality are most commendable, but the soul remains in unrest; and they will never come into the perfect peace and joy of the Christian life until they give themselves wholly to the Lord.—*The Central Christian Advocate.*

LITERARY.

By a lamentable oversight the name of the author, Rev. Prof. Dr. Francis Brown, was not given under the article *Assyriology* in the November instalment of the Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge.

We desire to call attention to the following title, *The Lily Among Thorns: A Study of the Biblical Drama entitled The Song of Songs.* By William Elliot Griffis, D.D., pastor of the Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, Mass., and author of "The Mikado's Empire." Boston and New York (Houghton, Mifflin & Company; the Riverside Press, Cambridge), 1890. 16mo, pp. viii., 274. We can do no more at present than notice the appearance of this volume. It is very dainty in binding, type, and shape, as befits the beautiful song of pure love which it explains. We commend Dr. Griffis' book to all students and lovers of the Word, in the full confidence that they will be instructed and edified by its contents. Of peculiar value is his defence of the Song against the slurs commonly uttered upon it. We reserve for a future number an adequate notice of the volume.

We begin our review of the magazines with Harper's. The December number is extraordinarily rich in illustrations, even for this magazine, whose usual numbers are so full of beautiful pictures. Other magazines appeal to our suffrages, but Harper's has for nine and thirty years been the favorite of the general public. Edwin A. Abbey illustrates "The Merry Wives of Windsor" in his inimitable way; Theodore Child writes appreciatively on Modern Russian Art, and the illustrations bear out his statements. There are several stories, and a novelette by Thomas Hardy, splendidly illustrated. But our attention has been particularly taken by the two articles of religious contents. The pastor of the Brick Church, New York City, Rev. Dr. Henry Van Dyke, can always be depended on to write entertainingly. His theme in this number is the "Flight into Egypt." This episode in our Lord's infancy receives appropriate treatment. Use has been made, naturally, of the apocryphal gospels, to supplement the meagre, passing notice in the canonical Matthew. He also utilizes later matter, and the whole is rendered resplendent by the illustrations. Dr. Van Dyke considers Holman Hunt's picture of the Flight into Egypt "the most important religious picture of the century." The readers are enabled to judge for themselves as to its attractiveness. The other article we mention is by Rev. H. R. Haweis, the well-known Broad Church clergyman in London, on "Oratorio and Drama." Mr. Haweis, whose name is pronounced *hoice*, by the way, is nothing if not original. He discourses on the past and future of religious music. The modern oratorio "is midway between the concert-room and the stage. It is not severely hymnal nor strictly devotional, but it abounds in meditation and praise." He looks forward to the production of a sacred music drama, the union of musical and dramatic art.

The Century for November, like its predecessors and rivals, is full of beautiful pictures, but the only article in its contents of special religious flavor is the first of the "Present-Day Papers," entitled "The Problems of Modern Society," written by Mr. William Chauncy Langdon. The "Present-Day Papers" are designed to discuss "certain sociological questions at present engaging attention, or of consequence to the well-being of the community." The writers who have undertaken this important service are Rev. Prof. Dr. Charles W. Shields, the author of the "Ultimate Philosophy;" Bishop Potter, of this city; Rev. Dr. Theodore T. Munger; Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.; President Seth Low, of Columbia College; Prof. Richard T. Ely, of Johns Hopkins University, and Mr. Langdon. The last named contributes the opening paper. He pleads for a Christian sociology, one which shall study the three divine institutions—the family, the State, and the church—as divine. He states briefly the problems under each head. What he asks is that these institutions be viewed from their religious side, and rightly says that to their "interrelation the master key can be furnished only by a Christian philosophy."

The December Century opens with a series of unpublished letters written by the Duke of Wellington, in his very last days, to a young married lady of England. These letters present the Iron Duke in a very attractive light—amiable and unpretending; the careful guardian of the children of his friend in their childish illnesses. Joseph Jefferson's autobiography is continued from the November number, and this month covers wide ground and goes into the most amusing details concerning "barn-storming in Mississippi," an interesting character called Pudding Stanley, Jefferson's Mexico experiences (just after the Mexican War), his reminiscences of the Wallacks, John E. Owens, Burton, etc. Mr. Charles Barnard's illustrated article on "The New Croton Aqueduct" is the first full account of that marvellous and unique engineering work. A striking feature of this paper is Mr. Barnard's exposè of the frauds in the building of the aqueduct—the empty places in the masonry being shown by means of photographs. Rev. W. E. Griffis, D.D., the well-known authority on Japan, writes of "Nature and People" in that fascinating island—more of Theodore Wores's pictures being given in this connection. The two celebrated French painters, Alfred Stevens and Gervex, give pictures of their "Paris Panorama of the Nineteenth Century," and tell how they came to construct the work, and their method of putting it on the canvas. Professor Fisher begins his striking papers in this number on "The Nature and Method of Revelation," taking up at once the subject of "Revelation and the Bible." In fiction we have Mrs. Barr's new novel, "Friend Olivia," Mr. Stockton's "The *Merry Chanter*," Hopkinson Smith's heroic story of "Captain Joe," founded on fact, and "The Taming of Tarias," by a new writer. The chapters of the Lincoln Life deal with the fall of Richmond and Lincoln's visit to the abandoned capital. Mrs. Van Rensselaer gives briefly her impressions of the French Exhibition; and the editorial pages come to the defence of civil service reform.

Scribner's for December has for its first article "How the Other Half Lives, Studies among the Tenements," by Jacob A. Riis, an illustrated true story of human crime and wretchedness in New York City. Mr. Riis has had exceptional facilities and opportunities in studying life in the slums of the metropolis. The views he gives are absolutely reliable, being not fancy pictures or drawings from memory, but reproductions of instantaneous photographs made by the flash-light. They tell a very sad story of crowded dwellings, with all their inevitable accompaniments of misery and sin. Mr. Riis writes on a theme of absorbing interest, and with the authority of personal knowledge. But he has little to say about the remedial agencies. If it were not for the Christian influences brought to bear upon this mass of humanity, the state of things would be much worse. The Hon. Edward J. Phelps's article on "The Age of Words" is a timely protest against the tendency of the age to utter and print words merely to say something, anything. He shows how this really absurd phenomenon has its bad consequences; how it has vitiated literature and made the press the great scandalmonger, and so the poison is carried into all homes. One of the secret causes of the divorces and matrimonial failures is the fiction upon which the unhappy wives were brought up intellectually. The article is very vigorous. Dr. William Perry Northrup describes "The Pardon of Ste. Anne d'Auray," a unique religious festival of Brittany. On the whole, the December number strikes us as being particularly good.

Lippincott's for December contains as its complete story—a feature this magazine now shares with the Cosmopolitan—"All He Knew," by John Habberton, which deals with the life of an ex-convict who was converted in prison. Maurice Francis Egan utters a mild protest against the "frankness"—a euphemism for indecency—of Dr. Ibsen, whose plays are being given in London. "Building Associations," by Thomas Gaffney, is the most useful article in this number. "Leon, the (Siberian) Exile," by Melville Philips, is sad, as are all stories of such characters.

The Magazine of American History for November has this table of contents: "Home of Charles Carroll of Carrollton," by the Editor; "A Chapter from the History of Utah," by H. H. Bancroft; "Rise of a Great Masonic Library in [Cedar Rapids] Iowa," by L. J. Lanphere; "The Stone Images of San Augustin," by H. R. Lemly; "Some Beginnings of Delaware," by W. W. Taylor; "The First Iron-works in America," by N. M. Hawkes; "Relic of Braddock's Field," by Z. McDonald; "Oliver Pollock," by H. E. Hayden; "Thrilling Story of a British Surgeon's Experience in the Revolution," by A. Van Sinderen; and other minor articles and notes.

The Atlantic for December is, as usual, good literature. Such articles as "Architecture in the West," by Henry Van Brunt; "Delphi: the Locality and its Legends," by William Cranston Lawton, and "Border Warfare of the Revolution," by John Fiske, would, in the illustrated magazines, have elaborate and costly pictures. But in The Atlantic there are no pictures, and they are not missed, the letter-press is so good.

The Cosmopolitan for December contains a lively article of interest to those who study foreign missions, "The Capital of the Dragon's Empire" (Peking), by Frank G. Carpenter. The illustrations are particularly good; that of the temple of Heaven will be looked at with the interest which attaches to past things; for the temple was destroyed by fire September 28th. Mr. Carpenter says that in Peking all religions are represented: there is a Mohammedan mosque, a great temple filled with Lamas from Thibet, and the chapels of the Christian missionaries, and the great observatory founded by the Jesuits. Mr. Edward Everett Hale, in the department "Social Problems," writes appositely on the influence of Christmas, or, rather, of the birth of Christ, upon the race. We all lead different lives, and have a quite different outlook on social problems. We are inspired by the example of Christ, and counting God on our side, we labor hopefully for the benefit of others. Mr. Hale informs us that a W. C. T. U. has been opened in Tokio! Japan is being rapidly civilized! He proposes to some philanthropist to erect residential flats for ladies similar to those in London, and mentions several remedial institutions, and the establishment of the Order of the Royal Law, a new species of the genus Wadsworth.

The Missionary Review of the World for November is at hand. Great improvement is noticeable in this Review from its initial number. It now presents a most valuable record, month by month, of the doings of the missionary host. We have only congratulations upon the success of the editors. The November number has in its table of contents the following: "The American Missionary in the Orient," by the author of the striking article "Islam and Christian Missions" in the August number; "The Great Crisis in Japan," by Rev. Dr. F. F. Ellinwood, one of the secretaries of the Foreign Board of the Presbyterian Church; "The Historic Churches of the East," by Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph.D.; "The Student Missionary Uprising," by John R. Mott; "A Christian College at San Paulo, Brazil," by Rev. Dr. G. W. Chamberlain. Rev. Charles C. Starbuck furnishes a translation of an article on the Continental Missionary Conference at Bremen, and also his usual condensed translations from foreign missionary journals, which constitutes so valuable a feature of this Review. Besides the articles named, the number contains the usual seven departments, made up from different sources—"General Missionary Intelligence," "Missionary Correspondence from all Parts of the World-field;" "International Department," conducted by Rev. Dr. G. T. Gracey; "The Monthly Concert of Missions," by Rev. Dr. A. T. Pierson; "Editorial Notes on Current Topics;" "Organized Missionary Work and Statistics," and, finally, "Progress of Missions—Monthly Bulletin."

The following religious works are announced as about to appear in England:

MESSRS. GEORGE BELL & SONS.

The Works of Flavius Josephus, Whiston's translation, revised by the Rev. A. R. Shilleto, with topographical and geographical notes by Sir C. W. Wilson, 5 vols.

Life and Epistles of St. Paul, new edition, by the late Mr. Lewin.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

The Rest of the Words of Baruch, a Christian Apocalypse of the year 136 A.D., the text revised with an introduction by J. Rendel Harris, M.A., formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and now Professor of Biblical Languages in Haverford College, Pennsylvania, royal 8vo.

The Gospel History of Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Language of the Revised Version, arranged in a connected narrative, especially for the use of teachers and preachers, by Rev. C. James, M.A., Rector of Wortham, Suffolk, and late Fellow of Kings College.

CLARENDON PRESS.

Sacred Books of the East, second series :—

Vedic Hymns, translated by F. Max Müller, Part I., Vol. 32.

Nârada, and some minor law books, translated by Julius Jolly, Vol. 33.

The Vedânta-Sûtras, with Sankara's Commentary, translated by G. Thibaut, Vol. 34.

Milinda Pañha, translated by T. W. Rhys Davids, Vol. 35.

The Nasks, translated by E. W. West, Vol. 37.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK.

"Beyond the Stars," or Heaven, its Inhabitants, Occupations, and Life, by Thomas Hamilton, D.D., President of Queen's College, Belfast; a new and cheaper edition, revised throughout.

The Way, the Nature and Means of Revelation, by John Weir, M.A., Dean of the Department of Fine Arts, Yale University.

The second issue of the "Foreign Theological Library" for this year will comprise:—

Professor C. E. Luthardt's "History of Christian Ethics," translated by Rev. Wm. Hastie, B.D.

Professor C. von Orelli's "The Prophecies of Jeremiah," translated by Rev Professor J. S. Banks.

MESSRS. HODDER & STOUGHTON.

Imago Christi, the example of Jesus Christ, by the Rev. James Stalker, M.A., author of "The Life of Jesus Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," etc., crown 8vo, cloth.

The Christian Ministry, its origin, constitution, nature, and work, the Donellan lectures for 1888, together with notes and appendices, by the Very Rev. William Lefroy, D.D., Dean of Norwich, 1 vol., 8vo.

The Philanthropy of God, by the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, M.A., author of "Social Christianity," crown 8vo, cloth.

Studies on the Epistles, by the Rev. Professor F. Godet, D.D., translated by Mrs. Annie Harwood Holmden, crown 8vo, cloth.

The Second Part of John G. Paton, an autobiography, edited by his brother, the Rev. James Paton, B.A., Vol. II., crown 8vo, cloth.

Charles Stanford, D.D., Memories and Letters, edited by his Wife, with etched portrait by Manesse, crown 8vo, cloth.

Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church, a History of Ireland and Irish Christianity from the Anglo-Norman Conquest to the Dawn of the Reformation, by the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and author of "Ireland and the Celtic Church," etc., crown 8vo, cloth.

The Revelation of John, an exposition, by P. W. Grant, author of "The Bible Record of Creation True for Every Age," crown 8vo, cloth.

CONCISE DICTIONARY
OF
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY
REV. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, M.A.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:
REV. TALBOT WILSON CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D.,
Of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York City,
AND
REV. FRANK HUGH FOSTER, PH.D.,
Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio.

[THIS DICTIONARY WAS BEGUN IN THE OCTOBER NUMBER AND WILL BE CONTINUED IN THE SUCCESSIVE NUMBERS, FIVE HUNDRED PAGES APPEARING WITHIN THE YEAR.]

NEW YORK:
THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY.
1889.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1. JANUARY, 1890. No. 4.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE DISPENSATION OF THE LOGOS.

BY WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D., MINISTER OF THE BROADWAY TABERNACLE, NEW YORK CITY.

THE prologue to the fourth Gospel is remarkable for its unequalled combination of simplicity of language with profundity of thought. It may be read with ease by a child not long out of the alphabet; yet it cannot be fully comprehended even by the greatest human intellect. Like a cloudless summer sky, it is a clear infinite, whose depths are in part revealed and in part also concealed by the dazzling brightness of the sun which shines in it, and which is so succinctly described in the words: "That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." It bears the same relation to the Gospel of which it is the introductory section that the enunciation of a proposition in mathematics does to the demonstration which follows it, for it sets fully before the reader the truth which its author designs to establish in the succeeding chapters. Indeed, the fourteenth verse, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," may be regarded as the text of the treatise. To the proof of the assertion made in these words every subsequent section contributes its own distinctive quotum, until at last the author is enabled to conclude with a Q. E. D. in this fashion: "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."

But in order that this fourteenth verse itself might be, in some degree, intelligible, it was needed that some preliminary statements should be made regarding him who in it is called "the Word," and these not only make clear to us who that person is, but also cast a flood of light on some other subjects which have perplexed the minds of thoughtful men. We cannot go into the consideration of all of these here, but in this brief paper we will confine ourselves to what we may call the Dispensation of the Word, or, to prevent ambiguity and using the Greek term, the Dispensation of the Logos.

Much has been written by learned men upon the Logos, and various explanations of the use of that term by the evangelist have been suggested. Some have traced it to the Jewish Targums, which describe those appearances of the "Angel of the Lord" that are recorded in the Old Testament as so many manifestations of the Word of God (Memra Jehovah). Others have alleged that its use by John is to be accounted for by the fact that Philo of Alexandria spoke much in his system of the Logos; while others still have referred it to the frequent recurrence in the writings of the Jewish prophets of the phrase, "The word of the Lord came to me," understanding by the expression "the word of the Lord" not an influence, nor a verbal communication, but a Person. It is difficult—perhaps we ought to say impossible—for us now to determine which of these theories, or whether any of these theories, is correct; all we really know on the subject is contained in this prologue, and on the very surface of that the following things are patent to every reader—viz., that the Logos is God; that he is yet in some way so distinct that it can be said regarding him that he was in the beginning with God; that he was the Maker of all things; that he had life in himself, which life was the light of men—"the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;" and that he became incarnate in the Person of Jesus Christ, who dwelt among men full of grace and truth, and was recognized as having the glory of the only begotten of the Father.

It is impossible to conceive of any stronger assertion of his Deity than this: "The Logos was God;" while if, as we sincerely believe, the doctrine of the Trinity is scriptural and true, we can at least, in some degree, understand how it can be affirmed that "the Logos was with God." For the rest, the appropriateness of the name Logos is apparent in the fact that he to whom it belongs is especially and peculiarly the Revealer of God. Thought is communicated only through word. Until it is thus—so to say—inverbated, it is hidden from all but the thinker himself; but when it is inverbated, it becomes intelligible to others, and can be apprehended by them. So Deity, in the abstract, is unrevealed. Only through the instrumentality of the Logos has he made himself known unto men, and so he through whom this revelation has been made may be fitly termed the Logos or Word, bearing as he does to the godhead the same relation which utterance does to thought. So, however we may account for the choice of such a term by John, whether he took it from Philo, or from the Targums, or had it directly suggested to him by the inspiring Spirit, the meaning of it in his hands is clear, and seems to us to be fully displayed by him when, in the last verse of the prologue, he says: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, *he hath declared him.*"

But now, having got hold of the significance of the term, the question faces us, "When did the Dispensation of the Logos begin?" and we find the answer in these words, "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that the revelation made by God through the Logos commenced with the Incarnation. The truth rather is that the Incarnation divides the Dispensation of the Logos into two periods: one the pre-incarnate and the other the post-incarnate. Now, the pre-incarnate, as the words just quoted make clear, commenced with the creation. That was the first "thought" of God which was made articulate by the Logos; and so soon as there was a human mind to apprehend it, that mind received from it some idea of the existence, the power, the wisdom, and, in a large sense also, the goodness of God. We talk, indeed, of natural as distinguished from revealed theology, and there is value in the discrimination made between the two. But yet, if we fully take in the teaching of the Evangelist in this prologue, we see that even that which men may learn regarding God from the external universe and from the intuitions of their own souls is itself a revelation made to them through the creation of all things by him who is the Logos. There never was a time, therefore, when the human race was absolutely destitute of a revelation, and for what of revelation they had from the beginning, they were indebted to the Logos.

Nor was it only through the external world that the Logos made a revelation of God by the creation. We must trace to the same source all those intimations of the existence, the nature, and the character of God which were given to men through conscience and the intuitions of the human mind. And if it be asked how much was comprised in such a revelation, Paul will help us to an answer in these words: "The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even his eternal power and Godhead;" and these others; when speaking of the heathen, he says: "These, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness."

Still further, the revelation, through the instrumentality of the pre-incarnate Logos, was made through history. That was very clearly the case with the Jewish nation; for that which was taught them by the prophets was given to the prophets, as Peter tells us, by "the Spirit of Christ in them;" and the Spirit of Christ in that connection must denote the spirit of the pre-incarnate Logos. To him, therefore, has to be traced all the revelation of God's nature, and of the relation of Israel and of men generally to God, which was given to the Jews in the Old Testament Scriptures.

But it was not among the Jews alone that the Logos was at work revealing truth to men, for Providence is universal, and we cannot doubt that all through the times before the advent of the Messiah, Providence, which is simply God, through the instrumentality of the Logos was carrying on a work of preparation as really among the nations at large as among the Jews. He did it among the Jews, indeed, through a special agency and in a miraculous manner; while he did it among the other nations through the common operations of his moral government, and without any miracle; but it was HIS working in both. Every nation had its own book of Leviticus, teaching the doctrine and regulating the practice of animal sacrifices. Among the heathen that book was not given by an inspired man like Moses, but each nation had what was virtually such a book, and it was as real, though certainly not as clear a forepointing to "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," in the one case as in the other. Then, in other respects, there were what Archbishop Trench, in one of his earliest works, so suggestively called "the unconscious prophecies of heathendom," all of which must be traced to the working in them and among them of the pre-incarnate Logos. Thus in manifold ways and over the whole world the Logos, even before the birth of the Messiah, was revealing God to men, and so he is most accurately described as "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

Then, passing to the post-incarnate period of this dispensation, we need not spend long time in treating of the revelation given by the Logos in that. In his character the visible Christ manifested the Invisible God, so that he could say to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." By his words he made known the love of God to the world. By his death he shewed how Jehovah is a just God, and yet the Saviour of sinful men. By his resurrection from the dead he took its sting from death and its victory from the grave, and brought life and immortality to light. But what need is there for us to say more here? If we were to attempt to give an exhaustive account of the truths revealed by the Incarnate Logos, we should have to classify and arrange all the statements contained in the New Testament, and all the doctrines which have been discovered in that wonderful book in those eighteen centuries of history, during which the abiding Spirit of Christ in the church has been teaching Christians through the opening of their understandings to understand the Scriptures.

Thus the Dispensation of the Logos in its two periods—the pre-incarnate and the post-incarnate—is a much wider thing than is generally supposed, and the two together comprise the history of the human race from the creation on till the consummation of all things.

Now, having reached this landing-place, let us pause in our investigation and take note of what we have learned. If the representation which we have given is correct, then it will follow that man has at no period been ever wholly without light. The first revelation was through the creation, and that has remained everywhere ever since. Men's minds, through sin, may not always have been equally able or equally willing to take in all that they might have learned of God from the material universe, or from conscience, or from history. But the light has always been there in some degree If men shut their eyes, or did not like to retain God in their knowledge, that was their guilt; but there was always some light; and to that agree the words of Paul to the men of Lystra, "Nevertheless God left not himself without a witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness."

Then, further, wherever there was light, and that was everywhere, and in whatever degree the light was enjoyed, we have learned that the Illuminator was the Logos. When one of the English Deists wrote a book, with the view of proving that Christianity is as old as the creation, his thesis, as he wished it to be understood, was not true. But, as we have seen, the revelation of God through the Logos began at the creation, and so the inference is clear that, wherever light is, there is Christ as the Logos. So the heathen before the advent came, and the heathen to-day, in so far as they have any true light as to God and duty and responsibility come, into contact with Christ. The heathen to-day are precisely in the same position as the heathen of old were. They are virtually under the dispensation of the Pre-incarnate Logos; but even so, it is still the Logos—the Spirit of Christ—that they have to do with.

So far we have followed the teachings of this section of John's Gospel; but that we may bring our examination to bear on some present currents of thought among us, we introduce here another statement, which, though not contained in this prologue, may be clearly deduced from other portions of Scripture. That statement is that the degree of light enjoyed is the measure of the responsibility incurred. This is evident from the words of our Saviour concerning Chorazin and Capernaum. The inhabitants of these cities had enjoyed greater privileges, or, in other words, more light than all who had gone before them, and because they had loved darkness rather than light He affirmed concerning them that it should be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, yea, for Sodom and Gomorrah, than for them. Both would be condemned, and both would be punished, yet not both equally punished; for the punishment of each would be according to the light of each. We are familiar with the thought that there will be degrees of glory in heaven; but the corresponding thought that there will be degrees of punishment among the lost has largely fallen out of view among us in these later days, and much of the perplexity that is felt by many on the subject of retribution is owing to that fact. There is one clear principle of the Divine administration applicable to all men alike, no matter at what age of the world's history they may have lived or in what land their lot may have been cast, and that is, that the degree of light enjoyed by each is the measure of the responsibility incurred by each. If a man has prized his light, and walked according to it, he will be accepted of God and saved at last, and his salvation will still be through Christ as the Logos, who has given him, or rather who is himself, that Light. If, on the contrary, a man has despised that light—no matter how small it may have been—and walked contrary to it, he will be condemned at last, and condemned because he has rejected Christ, who, as the Logos, was the Light that he enjoyed. Men do not need to have what has been called the "historic Christ" preached unto them in order to be brought into contact with Christ, for the Light, no matter what its degree, which they possess, is Christ, who, as the Logos, has in greater or smaller measure lighted every man that cometh into the world, and the principle underlying the words, "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much," warrants the dealing with all in the manner which we have described. There needs, therefore, no prolongation of probation into the future state in order that Christ may be preached to those who have not articulately heard of him on earth; for all have come really into contact with Christ who have had any degree of light, and their treatment of the little light which they had is evidence of the treatment which they would have given to more light if they had possessed that. Thus all men everywhere are dealt with on precisely the same terms, and God's justice is so conspicuously manifested as to need no vindication.

The practical outcome of all this, so far as we are concerned, is this, that if the degree of light is the measure of responsibility, then a very solemn responsibility must rest upon us. Never any people had such privileges as those which we enjoy. We have the Scriptures "in our own tongue wherein we were born," and we have perfect freedom to read them and to obey them. The special favors bestowed on the Hebrew nation were small in comparison with ours, so that, if we despise our opportunities and fail to improve them, our guilt will be greater even than that of those who crucified the Lord of glory and put him to an open shame, and our punishment must be of the heaviest. It were well, therefore, that we should give over speculations about the destiny of others, and concentrate our thoughts and efforts on the doing of our own duty. Let us give over asking the question, "What shall this man do?" and set ourselves earnestly to follow Christ. Let us cease to speculate on the question, "Are there few that be saved?" and strive ourselves "to enter in at the strait gate," for our primary responsibility, at least, is for ourselves.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

THE ASSAULT ON THE MONASTERIES IN ENGLAND UNDER HENRY VIII.

(Condensed translation, by Rev. C. C. Starbuck, from the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie.* III. Quartalheft, 1889.)

This article is founded on Aidan Gasquet's work, which rests upon protracted study of the original archives in the British Museum, as well as of those found in other libraries, both of Great Britain and the Continent.

Several Protestant writers, such as Brewer, and Dixon, and Blunt, who had preserved a good measure of historical impartiality, had already found reason to question the current English representations of the state of the monasteries under Henry VIII. They accuse the reports of the visitors sent out by Thomas Cromwell as teeming with untruths and monstrosities. Brewer allows that many causes concurred why the monasteries in England could no longer flourish as in their prime, "but the corruption was not so black and universal as party spirit would persuade us."

To say that P. Gasquet has arrived at the same results would be stating it inadequately. Gasquet, though in various points coinciding with Brewer, has made a far more extended study of the scenes attending the suppression, and has adduced a multitude of invincible proofs, such as set the proceedings against the monasteries in a wholly new light.

Gasquet, whose work, both in form and matter, has been acknowledged, both in England and Germany, as a historical work of the first rank, avows, of course, that his sympathies lay in a definite direction, but declares that he has taken the greatest possible pains to let facts speak for themselves, being convinced that in this case they are more eloquent than anything else. His book, with the weapons of modern research, sets forth with convincing energy the cruelty of Henry Tudor, the vileness of his motives, and the absolute worthlessness of the agents who wreaked this cruelty upon multitudes of devout and harmless men and women.

2. Henry's suppression of the religious houses had had various *precedents* in England. Since the Conquest, the English kings had shown little regard to the liberties of the Church, as witness Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket, and Edmund Rich, Archbishops of Canterbury. In 1294 Edward I., then at war with France, suppressed eighty or one hundred monasteries (mostly Cluniacs), banishing the monks as foreigners, but keeping their goods. His two successors recalled them. When, in 1312, Clement V., having suppressed the Templars, promised their possessions to the Hospitallers, Edward II. refused to execute the decree, and secured an act of Parliament for appropriating—ostensibly for pious uses, according to the mind of the founders—all these "masterless estates" to the Crown.

Edward III. began, it is true, by restoring most of the suppressed "alien priories." But needing money for his French wars, he in 1337 laid his hand upon "the foreign houses," not forgetting, moreover, to give sops to his nobility out of their goods. Not till peace was concluded, in 1361, was a part of the alienated estates given back. Henry IV. reversed some sequestrations of Richard II., restoring thirty-three monasteries, but in 1402 appropriated a part of their incomes toward maintaining "the king's household," while, at the instigation of the Wycliffites and Lollards, proposals were already broached in Parliament and the Privy Council for a general suppression of the monasteries and a restriction of church property in general.

In 1405, in the Parliament whose Socialistic and Wycliffistic vein has brought it into disrepute as "the unlearned Parliament," the Speaker proposed to secure a rich supply to the empty treasury by a general ecclesiastical confiscation. Only the energetic remonstrances of Archbishop Arundel, and his humble representations to the King, averted the danger. The King, however, indemnified himself out of the "vacant bishoprics and abbeys." Indeed, Henry V., in 1413, and Henry VI., in 1437, received papal permission, on political grounds, to suppress the Cluniac (and some Carthusian) monasteries of French monks, and to apply their goods to the benefit of other houses, as well as to the foundation of colleges in Eton, Winchester, Oxford, and Cambridge, with the obligation, however, of suitably indemnifying the foreign owners. Henry VII. was allowed some similar privileges toward reduced houses. Finally, Henry VIII., conjointly with Wolsey, in 1521 suppressed Bromehall Nunnery, on an unproved charge of scandals, alleging, *pro forma*, the concurrence of the now beatified John Fisher. Fisher in 1524, it is true, suppressed a nunnery of his own diocese, whose nuns, reduced to three, afforded reasons, both moral and canonical, for the suppression.

Yet all these precedents are a trifle to the violences which Wolsey began to exercise, agreeable to his haughtiness and ambition. Having secured the Archbishopric of York, the Cardinalate, and, finally, after the saintly Archbishop Warham, of Canterbury, the Chancellorship, he seemed at the summit of his desires. Yet he tried to importune the Pope into appointing him Legate, with supreme right to visit all monasteries, even exempt ones. Bribery was to help; he transmitted to the English agent ten thousand ducats, *propter liberalia.* Leo X., however, did not consent, but in 1518 sent Campeggio to England as Legate. The exasperated Wolsey, however, so wrought upon Henry that he fairly intimidated the Pope into naming him joint Legate. He knew that on English ground he could easily extinguish the Italian Campeggio. At last the bull giving Wolsey the right of Visitation of the Religious Houses was issued at the end of 1518. This put into the hands of the English Chancellor such an authority as scarcely ever a Prince of the Church has had. His almost unbounded influence over Henry made him almost as good as king; as Legate, who had, moreover, extorted from the Pope extraordinary powers, he was supreme ecclesiastical governor of the realm. Thus, uniting both swords in one hand, he was well described as ruling both king and kingdom, and as being seven times as high in repute as if he were pope.

He used his new power at first creditably. In 1519 he gave the Augustinian Regular Canons new statutes, which, without complaining of any previous laxity, reinculcated strict observance. He found, neither in monks nor nuns, any sign of disaffection. Only the Franciscans of the Strict Observance did not relish an interruption of their close connection with their General in Rome.

In 1524 his official visitation changed its character. Leo the Tenth's death drew Wolsey's own ambition to the vacant chair. Officers, secular and ecclesiastical, were in commotion; nor were simoniacal means forgotten. How little faith can Wolsey have had in the exalted character and the sacred duties of such a dignity! His disappointment rendered him only the more imperious toward the new Pope, Clement VII. He required him, in an almost menacing tone, to confirm to him Leo's grant of powers. To his bishoprics, a mandate of the King now added the incomes of the great abbey of St. Alban's, compulsorily held vacant.

He next demanded a bull giving him discretionary rights of suppressing religious houses. With the revenues he intended to gain the credit of a great lord and princely founder, by erecting colleges at Oxford and elsewhere. This bull was, of course, refused; yet Clement yielded so far as to authorize Wolsey, in favor of Oxford, to suppress some almost extinct houses, yet on condition of their consent and the King's, provided the monks were most considerately treated, and well provided for in other houses. This measure was very lucrative to Wolsey, but in Kent and Sussex and other southern counties it provoked a veritable tempest of popular displeasure. There were even insurrections, when Archbishop Warham's remonstrances to Wolsey had availed nothing. The Duke of Suffolk (the King's brother-in-law), Sir Thomas More, and other men of note expostulated both with Henry and Wolsey over the reckless manner in which the Cardinal's agents proceeded, especially Allen and Thomas Cromwell, afterward so notorious. The monasteries, these gentlemen said, were "a help to the people," and dearer to them than had been supposed; their superiors, too, were in good repute as virtuous men. All in vain. The agents hastened from house to house, and even where they could find no pretext for suppression, induced the superiors of various monasteries, by threats and false reports, to advance large sums as a means of averting secularization.

The ominous example of the Cardinal Legate, notwithstanding that Henry for the moment (in 1527) expressed himself very disapprovingly, was not to fail of its effect upon the covetous Tudor.

Early in 1527 the King, we well know why, began to entertain scruples as to the validity of his marriage. In the autumn began the negotiations with the Pope, then shut up in St. Angelo with some cardinals after the sack of Rome in May by the Constable Bourbon. Wolsey, availing himself of Clement's straits, urged on him the granting of unexampled powers. Gardiner, his agent, threatened, in case of non-compliance, that they *would settle church matters in England without the Pope.* He also extorted extensive powers for Francis I. All the monasteries were to be suppressed, and, where occasion required, cathedrals to be erected in their place. When the Pope gave a preliminary consent to this disposition of some monasteries, but required first exact reports of them, Wolsey's agents shamelessly urged against these the vilest calumnies. The next year Clement fell sick, and on a false report of his death Henry VIII. left neither influence, bribes, nor threats unused to put Wolsey in his place. Indeed, his instructions make clear that, if disappointed, he meditated *setting up Wolsey as Antipope, and so inaugurating a schism,* as the Emperor intimated, in great perturbation over the Pope's health. Clement, however, to the great disappointment of both Henry and Wolsey, recovered. It now appeared that in the bulls issued in 1528 at Wolsey's urgent instance, the Chancellor's agent had falsified and enlarged the numbers of the monasteries in question. Wolsey now insisted on the omission of the clause *de quorum consensu interest.* The Pope consented, declaring, however, that, agreeably to the King's wish, full power was given to suppress monasteries for the founding of new bishoprics and cathedrals, but that, in case wrong should be done to any in the execution, the conscience of the Cardinal Legate must remain charged.

However, the days of the mighty Chancellor and Legate were numbered. Wolsey never had opportunity to use his enlarged authority. Forty-four Articles of Impeachment were exhibited against him in the Parliament, five relating to his violent proceedings against the monasteries. They allege that the Chancellor Legate, having, by false representations, extorted from the Pope exorbitant powers, had in practice far exceeded even these. He had shamelessly, it is declared, "suppressed over thirty houses by driving virtuous men out of their home;" had only conceded the choice of abbots and priors on payment of impoverishing imposts, thus withdrawing from the monasteries the power of exercising hospitality and helping the poor, so that the land was overrun with beggars, vagabonds, and thieves, who had formerly had their wants met from the revenues of the convents.

It seems impossible to doubt that the supremacy of the State over the Church and the entire confiscation of monastic possessions, as afterward carried through under Thomas Cromwell, is to be mainly regarded as a fruit of the lamentable seed which Wolsey sowed.

3. THE FRANCISCANS.—In treating of the suppression of the religious houses, we can-

not pass over the execution of the so-called Holy Nun or Maid of Kent, Elizabeth Barton, inasmuch as it has often been asserted that the behavior of this nun and of her clerical associates (certain Benedictines, Franciscans, and secular priests) first irritated the King against the regular clergy. New light has been cast on the fate of the unhappy nun by official documents published in England, and others discovered by P. Gasquet.

Referring to an earlier dissertation for full particulars, we would simply say here that Gasquet, eliminating popular rumor, shows that what was actually foretold actually came to pass. The beatified bishop John Fisher relates that the nun declared that unless Henry repented he would in seven months no longer be King of England. And in seven months the adulterer was actually excommunicate, and thereby, according to ecclesiastical law, and English law in particular, had forfeited crown and regal dignity. It is also shown that it was through a fictitious confession of hers that the Blessed Thomas More was led to blame himself for having given credit to her, and, alas! was brought at last, with her Benedictine friends of Canterbury, even to declare the devout and innocent maiden a hypocrite.

The Parliament of 1534 had to deliberate on measures looking to the total extinction of the papal jurisdiction over England. Above all, Henry was eager for the *Church possessions,* which he appeared inclined to view as his patrimony. Among the provisions by which the supreme ecclesiastical power was conveyed to the King was one to the effect that the Crown should henceforth enjoy that unrestricted right of visiting the monasteries and fraternities which the Pope had exercised, together with the absolute right to dispose of their goods. It is declared with special emphasis that no bishop or archbishop or other person shall presume to regulate the monasteries without royal consent, or to act as their patron—an exemption of a new sort, and that the worst!

It might have been expected that in the higher clergy, especially among the Bishops, there would be found men that would intervene for those thus threatened, and apprise the Christian people of the designs of the Government, and the danger threatening the faith. But so confused were men's minds as to the extent of the Crown's ecclesiastical prerogatives, that even bishops of undoubted catholicity are found soliciting the royal license for the exercise of their purely ecclesiastical functions! When, therefore, the King gave orders to preach publicly against the Pope, there was no longer any noticeable resistance. Henry's instrument, the ever-pliable Cranmer, most emphatically inculcated the command in "his Archdiocese." The people disliked such preaching, but many parish priests were frightened into it.

Yet the preachers from among the *regular* clergy were not so easily perverted into organs of royal tyranny and pseudo-episcopal charges. In London the Franciscans of the Strict Observance, called Observants, were especial favorites as popular preachers. They declared themselves with great frankness and steadfast energy against Henry's ecclesiastical policy. Two of them had already, as "Confederates of the Holy Maid of Kent," with two Benedictines and two secular priests, attained the crown of martyrdom. There were six houses of Observants in England, that at Greenwich enjoying the chief reputation for good discipline and blessed fruits in the office of preaching. Here the divorced Queen Catherine had, in better days, daily attended the offices and the Holy Mass, and often Matins at night. Here, too, she had chosen an enlighted confessor in the person of the saintly P. Forest.

These monks energetically rallied to the banner of orthodoxy. They especially defended the validity of Henry's first marriage. The two unhappy traitors, John Laurence and the lay brother, Richard Lyst, having apprised Cromwell, the superiors, Forest and Pecock, were thrown into prison; Peto and Elstow banished; Payn and Cornelius, returning from a visit to the lawful Queen, were thrown into prison, but nothing appearing against them, were soon released.

To ascertain the temper of the Friars Observants, with a view, if he disliked it, to their punishment or expulsion, Henry, despite their protest, named the Dominican John Hilsey and the Augustinian-Eremite George Brown as Provincials and Visitors of their houses, and subsequently rewarded them as compliant instruments with bishoprics, naming Hilsey as the Blessed John Fisher's successor in the see of Rochester, and making Brown Archbishop of Dublin.

The Visitors, *ex gratia regis,* proceeded at once to fulfil their mission in the houses of the Observants. They assembled the religious, and commanded them to swear to acknowledge Anne Boleyn as lawful Queen, to take oath to the King's supremacy, to acknowledge Cranmer as Archbishop, to preach after the King's instructions, and to give in an inventory of all movable goods and church vessels of their houses. Immediately, encouraged by the proceedings of the Government and the unsettled times, worthless men, adventurers, apostate or apostatizing priests, discredited students, conscienceless officials, felt a vocation to act as Visitors on their own account. They forced their way into the defenceless houses of various orders, especially nunneries, pretending a royal commission, and advising prudent gifts to the King, to avert suppression. These threats and extortions inaugurated a reign of terror among the monasteries. The Government was so little concerned that Cromwell declared to a certain criminal that if he would only give information against the houses he might expect a pardon. This sharpened the inventive wit of all the villains in the land, and thenceforth the outrages against the monasteries knew no bounds. Almost incredible acts of violence of this kind are established by thoroughly authenticated documents.

Unquestionably some regulars gave way to the royal demands, but the great majority stood firm. The people applauded their manfulness; indeed, when a London preacher bade prayer for Anne Boleyn, everybody left the church.

Whatever partial success the two Commissaries or new Provincials might have in the other Franciscan houses of England, in Greenwich all their efforts were vain. The friars being reminded that, as non-exempt regulars, they owed obedience to the King and the Archbishop, these brave sons of the patriarch of Assisi replied: "Our rule gives us the Pope and his representative as our Superiors; all other authority, spiritual and secular, we acknowledge only so far as is consistent with God's law, the Pope's authority, and our Rule." The result was the suppression of the Observant houses and imprisonment of about two hundred monks. Fifty died of their privations; a good many, by intercession of influential friends, were in 1537 privately shipped off to France, Scotland, and Ireland. Indeed, Cromwell was glad at last to be rid of them. Thirty-two, bound two and two, were transported to the jails of different towns. Their further fate is known only to God.

The most famous of these brave men, the Blessed John Forest, Guardian of the Greenwich Convent and legitimate Provincial, remained, with some few intervals, from the spring of 1534 to that of 1538 in a mild imprisonment, being allowed to say mass and hear confessions outside the Tower. "But this," reports the pseudo-bishop Latimer of Worcester to Cromwell, "seems only to strengthen him in his frowardness." This hastened the decision. The High Commission, consisting of Cromwell, Cranmer, and Latimer, in solemn session, pronounced the sentence that John Forest, being stubborn in maintaining the heresy of the papal jurisdiction and refusing to swear to the royal supremacy, shall, on May 22d, 1538, die the death of fire at Smithfield.

On the appointed day two great gallows were erected at Smithfield, over which in mockery the cause of death was set up. Between the two main beams was a hammock with great rings; underneath was the pile of wood, in sacrilegious sport mainly composed of a huge statue of St. David of Wales. At the appointed hour appeared the Lord Mayor, Richard Gresham, with his sheriffs; the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, the Lord Admiral and the Lord Keeper Cromwell, besides many members of Parliament and a numerous throng of the people; finally Latimer, whose duty it was to preach, in order to make a final effort for the "conversion" of Forest. But all his efforts were broken and foiled by the steadfastness of the holy man, who declared that if an angel from heaven came and preached another gospel than that which he had learned as a child, he would not believe him; and that if they hewed his members to pieces one by one or all together, and burned them, he would yet, by God's grace, not be moved from his persuasion, his confession of faith and his vows. All delay appeared profitless. Chains were cast about the body and under the arms of the hero of the faith. Thus suspended over the flames, he was roasted alive. In his fearful agonies, the tortured man strove to climb up the ladder, to withdraw his body a little from the fierceness of the heat. The heartless spectators and the chronicler Hall believed themselves to discover in this a token of his guilt. The fools!

4. THE CARTHUSIANS.—Although the sons of St. Bruno, living wholly secluded from the world in the Charterhouse in London, did not, like the pastorally active Franciscans, take an active part in the opposition to Henry's divorce, yet Cromwell, even during his conflict with the Franciscans, began to proceed vigorously against them. The fame of their personal sanctity and their well-known faithful devotion to the Holy See, and especially the report that the Prior of the Charterhouse, Father John Houghton, was accustomed privately to admonish his brethren and all his penitents to remain

steadfast in the ancient faith and the acknowledgment of the papal supremacy, was enough to bring them into suspicion with the King and his minister.

In April, 1534, two royal commissaries, Lee and Bedyll, appeared in the monastery and required all the monks to subscribe a declaration of the validity of Henry's new marriage and the right of Anne Boleyn's children to the Crown. Refusal was followed by the imprisonment of Houghton, the Prior, and Middlemore, the Procurator. Archbishop Lee and Bishop Stokesley, it is true, succeeded in convincing them that the succession of Anne's children was not a matter of conscience, whereupon they were released. Houghton declared, however, that it was divinely revealed to him that this was only a respite. All the monks finally took the oath, yet with the reservation, "so far as is lawful."

From this hour peace departed from the Charterhouse. Some were glad henceforth to shake off the yoke of discipline. One even turned traitor, and begged Cromwell's favor, already, he said, shown to one of his brethren, John Norton, who had a canonry.

The Prior of the Brigittine monks was deputed to complete the conversion of the Carthusians, taking them by one or two at a time. Six finally agreed "to hold with the King touching the Bishop of Rome."

Meanwhile arrived the year 1535, which, on January 15th, was to bring to the King the long-desired title of Supreme Head or Pope of the English Church, and with it unbounded power over all causes or persons ecclesiastical, and no less absolute power for suppression of civil rights and for extortionate imposts. Proceedings against the religious houses recommenced with new energy. Though some Carthusians had given way, by far the most remained steadfast to the Catholic Church and the Pope. The Prior admonished his monks to patient endurance and to a preparation of conscience, that they might be at any time ready. There followed a touching scene; all, on their knees, begged forgiveness of their mutual wrongs and failings Two other Carthusian priors and a Brigittine monk, whom his "loyal" prior had not persuaded, were, with Houghton, thrown into the Tower. A petition for grace was their new offence.

All four refused the oath of supremacy. The court, however, scrupled to condemn them, until Cromwell burst into the hall in a rage, and threatened the judges in case of non-compliance. They were then adjudged guilty of high treason.

Between sentence and execution the royal commissioners were busy in the Charterhouse to persuade the monks that had remained faithful to apostasy, but to no purpose.

May 4th the three priors, Houghton, Laurence, and Webster, and the Brigittine monk Reynolds, as well as John Hale, Vicar of Isleworth, a secular priest, were executed at Tyburn. The execution was attended with great display. The chief officers of the realm, the Duke of Richmond, the King's illegitimate son, the Duke of Norfolk, premier peer, and, indeed, almost the whole court were present. There were also present five knights with closed visors, one of whom, as the ambassador of Charles V. wrote home, was surmised to be the King, as the other four showed him extraordinary respect. The martyrs died with words of thanks to God for giving them grace to die for his name and the Catholic faith; they declared themselves ready to obey the King in all things lawful, but, above all, to be minded to fear God and to abide faithful children of the Church. The bodies of the heroes of the faith were quartered, the arm of Houghton, as a bloody and deterrent sign to his brethren, being placed over the entrance of the Charterhouse.

Immediately afterward three other Carthusians—Humphrey Middlemore, William Exmew, and Sebastian Newdigate—were imprisoned, loaded with chains and blocks, fearfully tortured, tried, condemned, tortured anew, and finally, at Tyburn, released by the executioner's hand from their sufferings.

During the next two years the Carthusian family was spared imprisonment, in the hope that a strict watch over them, friendly persuasion, followed by rigorous dealing and multiplied privations, would knead them into pliancy; unhappily not without success, inasmuch as two monks, Rawlins and Trafford, denied their conscience and went over to the King's side. Trafford was made Prior of the Charterhouse, which he afterward ceded, with all its estates, to the King. The other monks, however, would not acknowledge the jurisdiction of this Prior, *gratia regis*, so that thenceforth, as the historian remarks, every Carthusian in London was his own prior.

Yet neither good nor evil accomplished their aim. The spirit of the ancient Christian martyrs lived anew in the most of these monks, so that the King and his minister, if they would not own themselves vanquished, found themselves obliged to proceed to extremities. Five or six commissioners took up their abode in the monastery, to shut the monks out from all intercourse, even among themselves, except with heretical disputants and preachers, while good books were withdrawn and heretical books urged, though vainly, upon them. Some were sent to "loyal" houses in the North, and some in London, in the hope of overmastering their consciences.

A year later, May 18th, 1537, the royal commissaries repaired to the Charterhouse, and summoned the still numerous monks to a Chapter. The prior Trafford, noted above, and twenty monks, took the prescribed oath. Only ten steadfastly refused—three priests, a deacon, and six lay brothers. They were condemned to endure in prison sufferings almost indescribable. A courageous woman of note, Margaret Clement, had leave of their keeper to tend them secretly. Disguised as a milkmaid, she made her way in, and was dismayed to find the pious men so helpless with hunger and chains that she herself had to put the food into their mouths. She thus prolonged the lives of the heroic sufferers for a few days.

When the King heard that the refractory monks had not yet yielded to famine, he set a still stricter watch. But even then the noble woman found means of helping them. She climbed the roof at night, broke it up, and by a string swung a basket of food around from mouth to mouth. Of course this could not last, and within three weeks nine of the sufferers succumbed to their sufferings. The tenth, Brother William Home, languished on during three years in squalor and wretchedness, and was executed in 1540 at Tyburn. Of the four sent North, two, John Rochester and James Walwercke, received the palm of martyrdom at York.

Thus, of the forty-eight original brethren of the Charterhouse, there were remaining twenty, with their Prior. They surrendered their house and estates to the King, receiving in return rather scanty pensions, and in 1539 were turned out of their home. One of them, Maurice Chauncey, fled to the Continent, and practised a vigorous life-long penance for his fault. He there wrote the history of his happier martyred brethren, unreservedly acknowledging therein his own guilt. The Church and monastery were granted by Henry VIII., in 1542, to two merchants, and Chauncey describes with horror the desecration of the holy places and the abomination of desolation in the sanctuary, and how the hallowed altar itself was abused for a gaming table.

5. THE VISITATIONS OF 1535–36.—We have somewhat anticipated. In the year in which the first Carthusians and their companions sealed with their blood their testimony for their Church, the two great confessors, John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and the Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, likewise died the glorious death of martyrdom. Misfortune seemed now to break in upon England from every side. Strained relations abroad, disquiet and despondency at home, the most unfriendly summer in human memory, almost incessant rains, an almost total failure of the harvest, and consequent distresses of the tenantry, were an accumulation of evils in which the people saw Heaven's vengeance on Henry's crimes and on the slaughter of holy men.

Cromwell saw well that higher taxation was the nearest way to general rebellion. Scarcity was followed by pestilence, so that Parliament had to be prorogued for half a year. The public treasury was empty; profusion, embezzlement, and maladministration had so drained it that even the modest wants of the unfortunate Catherine of Aragon could not be met. Henry now cast his thoughts anew upon the treasures of the Church. Costly vessels and valuables of the cathedrals were offered as "presents" to appease his rapacity; but increase of appetite grew by what it fed on.

There came to maturity in the mind of the absolute ruler the plan, which he had once advanced but had not carried through against John Fisher's energetic opposition—namely, the suppression and expropriation of the "lesser Abbeys." "Once appropriate the lesser," said the now beatified Bishop, "and the greater must soon come after."

In the resolution to deliver a decisive stroke against the religious houses, Henry and Cromwell had a double end in view: (1) to destroy the "papal system," or the Roman Catholic Church on the soil of Britain, in its most impregnable citadels; (2) to appropriate to themselves the treasures wherewith the piety of the faithful had, during nine or ten centuries, enriched the monasteries and their churches.

Cromwell devised an oath of supremacy, the exact face of which it is no longer possible to interpret, but evidently intended to provoke a refusal, and thereby lay the monastic possessions open to confiscation. But he was disappointed. As the Carthusians had sworn, yet afterward died as martyrs for the faith, so now almost all the English regulars believed that they could reconcile the oath with their consciences, and therefore swore.

To understand this, and to avoid precipitately stigmatizing such a course of proceeding as weakness of character, and charging with defection from the faith men who were of irreproachable life, and who in their time were accounted enlightened servants of God, we must carefully weigh the condition of the age and the workings of men's minds. It may be easy now to assume the black cap in judging all the clergy and laity of England, Fisher, More, and Forest excepted; for a discussion of three hundred years has solved many a perplexity. Yet this would be to hazard an unrighteous judgment. In the very year 1534 the highest dignitaries in Rome often judged Henry's proceedings with great mildness, and failed to find in it much that is now distinctly visible. Nay, we shall presently see that Paul III., as late as 1536, was very near apologizing to Henry VIII. for raising Fisher to the Cardinalate. And how it was possible in England to believe that one could take the oath with a reservation and yet remain Catholic, without any compromise of his faith, appears from the following. Among the State papers in the British Museum is a discourse delivered in 1539 by an Anglican bishop commissioned by Cranmer, in justification of the execution of several Benedictine abbots and monks. This openly declares that the oath which the abbots in 1534 and the Blessed John Houghton had believed themselves warranted in taking without prejudice to their salvation amounted to nothing, and left them still rebels to the King and servants of the Pope, inasmuch as they interpreted it only of obedience to the King in such points of Church usage as he had claimed from old the right to control as regulator of the temporalities of the Church, with the tacit allowance of the Pope.

How deeply, *per fas et nefas*, the English kings had for centuries made the Church feel their power, Albert du Boys has shown, and Cardinal Manning demonstrates that it is unreasonable to be too prompt to lay up against the heroes of the faith in the sixteenth century the acceptance of the *first* Oath of Supremacy. This oath, as this enlightened Prince of the Church points out, was an act whose significance is in our day unmistakable, but whose unchurchly, uncatholic sense was in the early days of Henry's persecutions as yet largely disguised and mitigated. Various schisms, the contemporaneous existence of several popes for a series of decades together during the two preceding centuries, and much besides that demanded a *reformatio in capite et membris*, had so bewildered the heads even of the most eminent theologians, like Peter d'Ailly and John Gerson (*de auferibilitate Papal*), that it is no wonder if English priests and monks failed to apprehend the scope of a declaration prejudicial to the rights of the Pope, and believed they could subscribe it, with or even without reserve. Even the admirably instructed, finely trained, beatified martyr Sir Thomas More acknowledged that he had formerly believed that one could be a good Catholic and yet hold that the Pope has his jurisdiction not *jure divino*, but only *jure humano;* and how he had studied seven years long, until he had become clear as to the truth, and had attained to the right insight.

Indeed, the question as to the permissibility of certain political oaths is one of the most difficult in all theology. To pass over the latest controversies in Belgium, Germany, and Italy, we would only bring to mind that, as to this very matter of the English Oath of Supremacy, theologians as late as Bossuet's time were of very divided views. And toward the end of the last century, when the persecution which had raged under the French Reign of Terror was, under the Directory, much abating, and a *new* oath was prescribed, the Bishops of France (*e.g.*, Lefranc de Pompignan) believed that they and their clergy could take it unreservedly, while those of Belgium (*e.g.*, Cardinal Frankenberg) rejected it.

As soon as Cromwell and his master discovered that their plan of inducing all the monasteries to refuse the oath, meaning then to abolish them all with one stroke, was frustrated, they endeavored to reach their goal by degrees. First, special encouragement was given to every monk or nun to prefer charges against superiors, the costs of inquiry to be borne by the convent. Thus discipline was undermined and delation encouraged. If a superior, on such testimony of a disaffected subject, should be convicted of "disloyalty," the monastery might be suppressed and its revenues confiscated to the Crown.

Thus, in the autumn of 1535, five Commissioners made a fresh progress through the land—choice fellows, who were to justify their evil repute still more clearly by perjury, incest, church-robbery, and embezzlement. Their names are: Dr. Legh and Dr. Layton, two apostate priests; Audeley, Dr. London, and one Ap Rice. Their instructions included eighty-five points of inquiry and twenty-five injunctions, to be interpreted by themselves. As a specimen: (1) All regulars under twenty-four, or such older ones as had been professed under twenty, were to be dismissed; (2) all who remained were to be held to "strict enclosure"—that is, were not to go outside the grounds of their house. Watchmen—jailers rather—were to see this precept vigorously carried through.

The British Museum still preserves such an instruction. The commissaries, on entering a monastery, were to assemble all its members in the chapter-house. They should then swear allegiance to King Henry, Queen Anne, and Anne's children, promising to teach the people accordingly. The Oath of Supremacy was then to be so explained as really to involve a new oath, which, however, was rejected in four-fifths of the houses, all "Reports" to the contrary notwithstanding. Then the Visitors should minutely inquire as to the style of preaching, especially as to the right exposition of Scripture. But, first and foremost, the Visitors were to make the most detailed and careful inquisition into the *possessions* of the convent, movable and immovable, valuables, church vessels, etc., exacting an oath to alienate nothing without government approbation, and to follow most punctually all the instructions of the commissioners.

The authentic reports of the commissaries to Cromwell, still extant in part, afford clear proof in what a reckless, rough, and cruel manner these discharged their office. The facts of seduction and violation of the nuns on the part of these unscrupulous Visitors decency requires us to pass over. Intimations of the worst sort are sufficiently afforded by the historians.

Many regulars and conventual superiors now submitted to the intimidations of power. The Commissary Layton reports to Cromwell, as to the Black Monks (the Benedictines): "In all other places whereat I come specially the black sort of devilish monks—past amendment—God hath withdrawn His grace from them." But if any one had a grievance, he was forthwith dispensed from all vows. Indeed, all were encouraged to throw off the cowl and marry, if they did not prefer a beggarly life in houses most of whose revenues the Crown had appropriated.

Monks and nuns on whom their vows had slight hold, and who were glad of an opportunity of evasion, were of course to be found. But they were the exception. The rule was: resolute opposition of all, as well superiors as subjects. The malcontents, therefore, were commonly advanced by Cromwell to be superiors of their houses and administrators of the revenues, as a transition to the cession of these to the exchequer. All monasteries, moreover, that wished to escape immediate dissolution had to pay heavily for delay.

6. THE SUPPRESSION OF THE "LESSER ABBEYS."—Early in 1536 died the unhappy Queen Catherine. The belief prevailed that she had been poisoned, and, if not at the suggestion yet with the knowledge of Anne Boleyn; at least so reports the Emperor's envoy. Yet the concubine was not long to enjoy her high eminence. Henry's inconstant favor having turned from her, Cromwell, from whatever motive, made haste to ruin her. Scarcely four months after the grave had closed over the pale form of Catherine, Anne's head fell by the sword on Tower Hill.

Meanwhile, Henry and his agents were making ready for a collective attack on the monasteries. This was to rest on an Act of Parliament; Cromwell, through his commissioners, had gathered a mass of reports—"comperts," *comperta*—touching the state of the religious houses. We may judge by the foregoing as to their worthlessness for the historian. Moreover, they are vague and inaccurate as to places, persons, and facts, and have throughout the stamp of vulgar calumny. Thus, one of the agents writes: "We *hope* (!) to find great corruption in the houses of the southern counties;" and in the report of the northern counties we read: "Everything, as in the south; we assume that in the monastery at York everything will be quite as bad and, if possible, even worse." Then follows a detailed description of revolting immoralities.

Luckily, however, these worthy agents betray only too plainly that their notion of an Inquiry was to write down whatever they thought most likely to meet the wishes of their principal. Layton, for instance, reports having, in fourteen days, traversed eight counties and visited eighty-eight monasteries! Consider that in those days of wretched roads eighty-eight monasteries were to be visited, their religious assembled in chapter, examined as to eighty-five points, twenty-five ordinances set forth and explained, and a precise inventory of all conventual property taken! Eighty-eight monasteries, dispersed over eight English counties, visited in this way within a fortnight! This Layton, then, must have had, from some source, the power of working wonders. That the lying fellow can have done nothing more than look at the most and then written down his own inventions or common tattle is plain. But what mattered that to Cromwell?

The reports of the Visitors were now, as professional history writers of England declare, gathered in a "Black Book" and presented to Parliament, and thus the English monasteries are declared to have been forever robbed of their good name on the ground of authentic evidence. For three hundred and fifty years the Acts and Protocols of the Parliament of 1536 were invoked as evidence that the monasteries in England under Henry VIII., on account of the abominable lives of their inhabitants, had entirely forfeited all claim to protection against royal caprice, and even against tyranny and spoliation. At the production of the "Black Book" a cry of indignant horror is supposed to have resounded through Parliament; it is assumed as proved officially, by an exact statement of facts, that two thirds of the English regulars were addicted to drunkenness, simony, and hideous immorality, and only a third—namely, the inmates of the great populous abbeys, had led a seemly life! But within a year these too "were all rotten, morally and physically past cure."

Gasquet proves now that through all these centuries English chroniclers, some in good and some in bad faith, had merely copied these stories from their predecessors, but that not one had taken in hand the authentic documents and tested them. In lieu of this, school-books have been so much the more zealously filled with all manner of blood-curdling legends of unchastity, secret murder, and all sorts of abominations, and thereby inspired the earliest years of youth with a pernicious horror of everything that bears the name of monkery. Acts provably or presumably laid before Parliament have not breathed a syllable to the effect that two thirds of the English regulars had led an evil life, nor yet has Parliament any more declared that one third—namely, the inmates of the greater Abbeys, had led a good one. Let us examine these parliamentary proceedings a little more closely.

The Parliament of 1536—mainly convened for the suppression of the religious houses—was a packed Parliament, not one freely chosen. Protests of towns or boroughs were simply ignored; persistency was rewarded with Newgate or the Marshalsea. But where an *election* could not be evaded, judges of elections, who knew their business, confirmed and annulled at Cromwell's nod. The resulting Parliament was essentially an assemblage of Henry's and Cromwell's creatures. A member inclined to express his own mind was simply *commanded* to remain at home.

The Upper House, as being hereditary, not elective, was less tractable. Besides some few secular lords still faithful to the Church, a number of abbots and bishops had seats. The spiritual peers, though a minority, would doubtless have great influence. It is true, most of the sees were supplied with Henry's obedient servants, and any who showed an inclination to stand up for the rights of the houses were by royal autograph and Cromwell's messengers remanded to their dioceses. As for the *abbots*, the imperial ambassador Chapuys wrote home several months earlier that, as this Parliament was intended to suppress the Abbeys, the King meant to exclude from it all the abbots. No wonder, then, that a Parliament assembled in which, as Hallam says, "Both houses yielded to every mandate of Henry's imperial will; they bent with every breath of his capricious humor." Yet there sat in it not only upstarts, like Russell, but the heads of the greatest houses—Norfolk, Arundel, Shrewsbury, Suffolk, Fitzalan. But indeed compliance had already been promised a share of the spoil. Many a scruple bent to this fair prospect. Indeed, so "well affected" were they that, as we shall see, the King could afford to dispense with their formal decision, and in this case of "exception and necessity" content himself with the assent of the House of Commons.

The Bill for "the Suppression of the Lesser Houses" was—a most rare occurrence—laid by the King himself on the table of the Lower House. This was evidently meant to throw the supreme authority of the Crown and the weight of his person into the scale, in order to assure the desired result. Yet he graciously declared he did not want them to sway in their judgments by regard of his person. He would again appear before them in four days, and hear their opinion. But as scruples made themselves felt about suppressing all houses of less than two hundred pounds' yearly revenue, he summoned Parliament before him, and with angry looks, turning to right and left, thus addressed them: "I hear that my bill meets with obstacles; but I will have it go through, or *I will have your heads.*" The Bill became law. One such putting of the question sufficed.

What were the *contents of the Bill?* The Parliament resolved that, in consideration of the report on the condition of the monasteries, it was to be accounted a work pleasing to God for the King simply to suppress every monastery whose yearly income did not amount to two hundred pounds, or, if wealthier, was occupied by fewer than twelve religious, and to apply the revenues to a better purpose, according to his discretion. Neither a written report on the state of the monasteries nor the so-called "Black Book" was read or even produced in Parliament. This contented itself with the oral declaration of the King that the lesser houses were unworthy to continue in being, as well on account of their bad administration as by reason of the lewd behavior of the monks and nuns. Indeed, the best historians, on good proof, transfer the "Black Book" to the time of Queen Elizabeth. According to them it contained proposals for the best manner of an entire suppression of the Abbeys. It cites no documents or visitatorial reports, but is an *anonymous undated summary of what had been done and was still to be done.* But the lately discovered actual visitatorial reports are not used in it. The author of the mysterious book had merely recounted after hearsay, without proof, that at most a third of the English regulars led an honest life, while two thirds led a hideous life, spotted with murder of their brethren, suffocation of little children, unnatural lusts, falsification of records, and like abominations. Unhappily the book itself, if it ever existed, has been lost; the above statements are derived from the old chroniclers, who profess to draw from it. Its unhappy loss is commonly attributed to the time of Mary the Catholic and Cardinal Pole. It is doubtful, from early notices, whether it antedates Elizabeth's reign. Even good Catholics, like Lingard, have allowed themselves to be imposed on here, and therefore many good Catholics, and even priests of to-day, entertain very strange opinions as to the monasteries of that time, and would rather let the question of their guilt rest than run the risk of tearing open a cicatrized wound of the Church.

A "Black Book" or authentic *comperta* of the Visitors having never been produced before Parliament, the story of a "cry of horror" is an ill-devised fable. The King had declared, by word of mouth, that the houses were bad and deserved chastisement, and this was the sole basis for parliamentary action. And the Parliament showed its mistrust of the King's declaration by its delay, till brought to compliance by vehement threats. And, as the scanty contemporary accounts state, it took care to put its action on the express ground that the King declared the case to be so and so.

Hall's statement that the greater abbots voted for the suppression of the lesser houses, in hope of averting this fate from their own, and that the Bishops and the Lords exclaimed that their turn would come, that the lesser houses were thorns to be cut up, but the greater were rotten old oak-trees to be hewn down, is convicted of fabulousness by the fact, supported by all accessible documents, that the Bill does not appear to have come into the Upper House at all.

Henry and Cromwell did their best, by sending skilful preachers about, to bring over public opinion to their side. These were to do their best to persuade the people that the monks were so evil in life as to make their suppression a work of piety. They even had mimes, in which some represented the monks, while another, representing the King, came near to smite off their heads. Or it was the Pope and Cardinals in effigy, whom the King would throw into the water. With such comedies both King and people diverted themselves.

The special preaching-place was in front of St. Paul's. Here all the London clergy must be present, and the hearers were urged to communicate what they heard to their families. Thus the gospel and the new faith were spread among the people. Even private expressions, not quite agreeable to government doctrine and policy, were severely punished.

Cranmer endeavored, and not without success, to sweeten the unpopular dealings with the monasteries to the popular taste by promising that the confiscated estates should long render other taxes superfluous.

7. THE COMPERTA MONASTICA.—Nothing is easier, especially among the crowd, than to calumniate an Institute or an Order, and nothing harder than to defend it by proving a negative. What, then, can be done with accusations three hundred and fifty years old, especially now that the authentic documents have mostly disappeared? Henry's own parliamentary declaration against the monasteries is nowhere to be found in writing. Yet this is the basis of the parliamentary action. This declaration, in turn, professes to rest upon the visitatorial reports. These, therefore, are the ultimate object of inquiry, especially the reports of Layton, Legh, Ap Rice, and London.

Fortunately, the *originals* of these are still in the British Museum. First, a great number of letters, written while on their rounds, addressed to Cromwell and others. Many of these had remained unpublished until examined by P. Gasquet. Besides, there is a volume of *Comperta*, the redaction of John, Ap Rice, from various sources, of which various copies were made for the King, Cromwell, and others. There are also special reports for several counties. In one they say outright that in some of the greater abbeys they could learn and accomplish absolutely nothing, for that superiors and monks, as "genuine Pharisees," stood resolutely together, and would give them not the least satisfaction. They suggest, therefore, in view of their scantness of time, a later commission, *ad melius informandum*, a naïve admission as to the untrustworthiness of their own. Again, remarking that many irregularities may be assumed of York Abbey, one of them says: "I will, therefore, attest thus, to help you out of your perplexity." The character of these reporters is described by the Protestant Gairdner as one which takes peculiar delight in revelling at full in the details of unmentionable obscenities.

No doubt the Visitors here and there found discontented or unworthy monks and nuns, and accusers of others. Evidently, however, the commissaries took no pains to sift these charges by personal examination; indeed, their lack of time would not have allowed this had they been so disposed.

No Institute, not even the Church founded by the Holy Ghost, is free of grave faults. But it is plain that *the monastic orders as corporations* did not deserve the stigma which has been put upon them; that the charges against them were calumnies or, at best, exaggerations of actual shortcomings, supplied by the unclean fancy of the reports, with drastic amplifications Nor must we forget that the abbots and monks of most houses positively refused to render to the Visitors any account whatever of their life or their possessions, deeming it beneath their dignity to hold any communication of self-vindication or self-excuse with such men as these agents of regal malice.

That the state of things was very far from being so bad as is commonly assumed is plain enough to see from the joy expressed by the Visitors when they now and then find a monk who promises ready compliance and a sum of money for the King and his minister, on condition of being made Abbot or Prior of his house.

Nor must we forget that the Visitors, in their letters and *Comperta*, make no distinction between greater and lesser houses. They throw them all into one heap, as being equally corrupt and decayed. The King, however, was pleased to say before the Commons, on the ground of his agents' reports, that the lesser houses were stark naught, but that in the greater the rules of their orders and Christian morals were well observed Apparently he and his crafty minister feared that if they made also an immediate attack upon such great and venerable abbeys as Glastonbury, Reading, St. Alban's, Bury St. Edmund, Westminster, St. Augustine's at Canterbury—abbeys so intimately cohering with English history and so dear to the people as places of pilgrimage and centres of beneficence—the popular resistance would become dangerous. Therefore the monasteries must be devoured, like an artichoke, leaf by leaf.

We are to notice that after the Bill of Suppression had become law, and the Parliament and people had been prepossessed and stirred up against the lesser abbeys, the Visitors continued their visits, but had no more to say about moral corruption. Exact computation shows that before the legal suppressions they had reported only on two fifths of the houses; afterward, of one hundred and fifty-five monasteries, they attribute to fifty as their sole offence a superstitious custody of relics.

There is nowhere a complete list of the inmates of a single monastery of men or women. But the following is good evidence of a comparative regularity and contentment of the regulars. In the province of York there were seventy-one monasteries. But Legh and Layton, with all their pains, can only muster here fifty male and two female regulars who expressed a desire to return into the world. Thus not as much as *one* person to a monastery who meditates apostasy! Yet many houses had from thirty to sixty monks. And yet the inmates of the seventy-one monasteries are to pass for universally degenerate! From these examples we may judge the rest.

As to the trustworthiness of the Reports, we must weigh the character of the Reporters Gasquet's and Gairdner's citations of letters show sufficiently that they were men who had absolutely no moral scruples, no sense of honor, whose only aim was to serve their own material interests and Cromwell's, even at the expense of honor and conscience. Blunt, an Anglican, says:* "Seldom has a tyrant chosen meaner and more vulgar instruments for his mean and vulgar intents than Henry the Eighth for the monastic visitations. The reader, who, at the very first view, detects them in so many evident and impudent lies, is exasperated and greatly inclined not to believe a word they say." The slightest charge against them is their unscrupulous acceptance, admitted by Froude, of blackmail from the monasteries, which, if not offered, they extorted.

The deep and abominable indecencies with which the Commissioner Richard Layton defiles his reports bear witness to a deeply bestialized nature. It is well said that a man of right feeling does not know how to defile his hands by contact with such letters. Layton, one of Cromwell's most serviceable agents, was an apostate priest. Legh was a young lawyer, whose colleague, Ap Rice, repeatedly complains of his haughtiness and vanity, of his avarice, and of his recklessness in formulating charges. Ap Rice seems to have been the least objectionable, but so obsequious that Cromwell never found matter of discontent with him. The fourth, London, was worthy of the first two, to say no more. He was accused of having offered violence to nuns at his first visitation, and subsequently there were proved against him perjury, unchastity—nay, incest, detected *in flagranti*. And on the evidence of such men alone were the regulars and their convents condemned.

---

* All these citations from the English, being retranslated out of the German, are, of course, in no way verbally exact.

8. THE SUPPRESSION OF THE REMAINING ABBEYS.—After the death of Queen Catherine in 1536, and the tragical end of Anne Boleyn, it was hoped that, the stone of stumbling being now removed, the King would be found inclined to reconcile himself with the Pope and the Catholic Church. The English ambassadors to France, as well as the foreign courts, openly expressed this expectation, and the English people made open demonstrations of their hope of a return, and that, the cause of offence being removed, the disinherited Mary would be declared heir to the Crown, and that England could return to the communion of the Church, from which it had been violently torn away. Pope Paul III. showed himself well inclined to make such advances as might facilitate a reconciliation. A very small interested minority apart, the English people, nobility, clergy, and burgesses, would have been thoroughly well content to see the Royal Supremacy and the pretensions of the monarch to rule over the consciences of his subjects and to exercise spiritual jurisdiction abolished. The difficulty lay in no abstract unwillingness of Henry to return within the former limits of the legitimate jurisdiction of an English King. What held him fast in heresy and schism was his insatiable need of money, and the consciousness, after all his lavishness of outlay, that he no longer either could or would make good the spoliation of the Church estates, which brought him in a yearly revenue of thirty-two thousand pounds sterling, accruing to him from the suppression of three hundred and seventy-six monasteries. Money, be it noted, had then twelve times its present value. And those who knew Henry best were persuaded that he would do anything rather than pay back the stolen wealth.

Indeed, he had already established a Court of Augmentations, which should complete the transfer to the Crown of the escheated property, and smooth the path for the plundering of the yet subsisting Greater Abbeys. But he reckoned without his host. The London rabble might acclaim him, but in the land at large the monasteries were yet beloved.

The reckless, revoltingly brutal behavior of the emissaries sent to drive out the monks and nuns, who profaned the sacred vessels, turned the chasubles of the mass into horse-cloths, and beat over chalices and patens into silver scabbards for their daggers—this barbarity of the King's officers called out insurrections, first in Lincolnshire, then in Yorkshire, and at the same time came accounts of dangerous fermentations everywhere. The unhappy issue of these popular risings—notably of the so-called Pilgrimage of Grace—is known.

Some monks, as not unnatural, where the holiest objects were to be defended, had taken part in the insurrections, many under compulsion. This was a welcome opportunity for the King. Treason was for him a favorite tool. He had long desired to lay hands on the Greater Abbeys also, and what better way than to doom to death, on good evidence or bad, their abbots and their monks ! If evidence was lacking, the refusal of the Oath of Supremacy led to the same end.

At first, while the monks and nuns were simply turned into the street, the heads of houses, whether Superiors, Guardians, Priors, or Abbots, were allowed a small income. The Government now held itself absolved from all further regard to them. The Duke of Norfolk was instructed, where the regulars of a suppressed convent were found outside of their assigned locality, to treat them as vagabonds and enemies of public order. The common punishment of a first offence was flogging ; of a second, mutilation ; of a third, the gallows. The attempt to take down the gibbeted bodies for Christian burial was itself a grievous offence. In 1537, under the Dukes of Norfolk, Suffolk, Cumberland, and the Earl of Sussex and others, a veritable reign of terror prevailed. The King was minded to slake his thirst for vengeance and " give examples."

Meanwhile the King, by means of certain very elastic phrases and a statute concerning the succession—such phrases as " estate of inheritance," "persons convict, their heirs and successors"—had managed to introduce a complete revolution in English property rights. The confiscation to the Crown for high treason "and like offences" was extended so as to make *whole corporations* amenable as "successors" to such a forfeiture. Nothing more was needed to condemn Abbots and Superiors, as implicated in the revolts, to confiscate their estates and expel their monks and nuns. Thus in 1537 a whole series of the greater abbeys went to the ground. Some of these communities, it is true, were so foolish as to yield to the compulsion of making a "voluntary" cession of their estates to the King. And there were some lamentable apostasies, but these were exceptions. On the other hand, the history of this vandalism of overthrow records many glorious traits of noble faithfulness and love to their sacred vocation and to the Church on the part of very many monks and nuns.

In the autumn of 1537 the amount of confiscated monastic estates and possessions, movable and immovable, reached several millions (of marks ?); and in 1538 all the houses of the Mendicant Orders were already suppressed. The poor were most to be pitied, for the abundant doles of the great abbeys now ceased at once and forever. Up to 1540, besides the above-mentioned 376 monasteries, 202 more had been suppressed, great and small, among them 62 Benedictine houses. Thus from 8000 to 9000 regulars were left houseless; among them some 1800 Franciscans, Dominicans, and other Mendicants, and about 1700 Benedictines, 700 Cistercians, 1000 Regular Canons of the Augustinian and Premonstratensian order, etc., and some 1600 nuns of the different orders.

Among these houses of God thus fallen victims to the rapacity of a barbarous tyrant, a special interest attaches to three great Benedictine Abbeys—Glastonbury, Reading, and Colchester.

In the late autumn of 1539, Henry the Eighth's plans of destruction were almost all carried out; only some few houses were yet in possession of their legitimate owners and saw their religious life and their solemn worship still continuing for a little while within their walls. County after county had seen the King's commissioners doing their Vandal work, and monks and nuns in great number wandering about shelterless. "And com'st there not willing, then use I my force," was the word if any monastic superior held back; the indictment for High Treason, with all its hideous consequences, was the result.

There still lifted its head as one of the great pyramids in the midst of a sandy waste the renowned national sanctuary, the Abbey of Glastonbury, which thus far had braved all the assaults of the Vandals, and as it had beheld the beginning of England's national history, seemed not unlikely to survive its close. For fourteen years it had been ruled by a man who, venerable by his learning and talent for administration, not less than for the sanctity of his life, enjoyed the chief consideration among the prelates of England. For this very reason an example was to be made of him and his abbey, in order to show to the kingdom of what an enormous power and authority the King had to dispose, and what all those had to expect who should still venture by their refractoriness to cross the plans of the monarch. It is true, the Abbot Richard Whiting—such was the name of the venerable old man—as the last successor of so great a number of holy superiors of the thousand-year-old house, had long been odious as a shaveling and spy of Rome; and because he maintained in his monastery an irreprehensible regularity, and also exercised a great influence far and wide around him, attempts had often been made to lays snares for him. But his circumspection had warned him of every danger, and rent the craftily disposed nets. At last it appeared to Cromwell and his lord high time to make a riddance of this champion of the Roman Catholic Church, together with his Abbey, as a bulwark of the papal authority. As there was not the slightest reason to hold him guilty of complicity with insurrection, and as all appeals to avarice, ambition, and fear were fruitless, the final means must be resorted to. The Oath of Supremacy was proposed to him, which he, with almost all the monasteries, but under another form, had taken in 1534. As he now refused to take it, and had also a little while before taken the precaution of placing the Church treasures in safety, he, with the Abbots of Reading and Colchester, besides two secular priests and two Benedictine monks (the latter of Glastonbury or Reading), was condemned to death, and suffered the martyr's death, being hanged, drawn, and quartered, November 15th, 1539.

To give more effect to the execution of the venerable Richard Whiting, he was returned from the Tower to his home, and suffered the revolting barbarities of his sentence on a hill in view of his Abbey of Glastonbury, over whose portal his head was nailed, while the four quarters of his body were sent into the neighboring towns of Wells, Bath, Ilchester, and Bridgewater, “that all might know what fate awaits them that are not conformable to the King's Highness in all things.”

The Abbey was plundered and a part of the buildings destroyed. So sank the august national sanctuary in Somerset, the pride of Britain since the fifth century—indeed, since the apostolic age. The venerable spot where, as sacred legend declared, St. Joseph of Arimathæa had struck his traveller's staff into the ground and had preached the Christian gospel, the burial-place of so many holy bishops and abbots, kings and dukes, the *Roma secunda*, as the English chroniclers named it—this fell as a sacrifice to the rapacity of a lustful tyrant.

Under Mary the Catholic an attempt was made to re-edify the ruins and to people again the desolated locality with sons of St. Benedict. John Feckenham, Benedictine monk of Evesham Abbey, had under Henry VIII. shared the fate of his brethren, and in Edward the Sixth's reign, on account of his invincible readiness to confess his faith and his unwearied and skilful labors in defence of it, he had been thrown into prison. Under the Catholic restoration of Queen Mary (1553–58), the famous London Abbey of Westminster was restored, and Feckenham was made Abbot. The scattered Benedictines of the realm, who had escaped the axe or famine or a murderous incarceration, as well as a numerous choir of young novices, flocked around the man of God. This gave room to hope that the darling wish of Catholic Albion might be fulfilled, and a colony sent out to repeople Glastonbury. A petition had already been presented to the Queen and the Lord Chancellor for the retransfer of the confiscated buildings and of the desolated church, inasmuch as already “there were various monks that were ready to renew their life there in peace according to the rule of St. Benedict, and to be helpful toward the salvation of the forsaken faithful.” Unhappily, the impending turn in the history of England made the carrying out of this plan impossible; for Mary's early death, in 1558, crushed all the bright hopes attaching to the incipient Catholic restoration. Feckenham, in whose breast the lofty plan had ripened, was, under Queen Elizabeth, for yet long years to combat effectively for the Catholic faith by word and pen, until, after a tedious imprisonment, he, on August 5th, 1585, died the death of the Confessor.

THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

(A Paper read before a special meeting, Nov. 4, 1889, of the Presbytery of New York, and given by Dr. Schaff for republication in this Magazine.)

THE Westminster Confession of Faith is the clearest, strongest, and most logical statement of the Calvinistic system, but contains with it certain supralapsarian or hyper-Calvinistic features which are not necessarily connected with the system, but belong only to a school of theology in the Reformed Churches, and have always been disputed. These are the connected doctrines of reprobation, preterition, limited atonement, and the damnation of the whole non-Christian world, including (by inference) non-elect children dying in infancy.

The passages in which these doctrines are taught are as follows:

Chap. III., Sec. 3. “By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.”

Sec. 4. “These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.”

Sec. 6. . . . “Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.”

Sec. 7. “The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice.”[*]

Chap. VI., Sec. 1. “Our first parents being seduced by the subtlety of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin God was pleased, according to His wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to His own glory.”

Chap. X., Sec. 3. “Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.”

Sec. 4. “Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law

---

[*] By “passing by,” or preterition, is meant, of course, not a *temporary*, but a *permanent* omission, with everlasting consequences, in harmony with Chap. III., Sec. 3. In a restricted sense it would be true, as the salvation of the world proceeds gradually, beginning with the Jews, and passing to the Gentiles in a certain order of providential preparation and succession.

> of that religion they do profess: and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested."

The Confession also teaches that the Bishop of Rome is the Antichrist predicted by St. Paul, and that the Papists, *i.e.*, the Roman Catholics, are idolaters.

> Chap. XXV., Sec. 6. "The Pope of Rome . . . is that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the Church, against Christ and all that is called God." *
>
> Chap. XXIV., Sec. 3, forbids marriage "with infidels, Papists, or other idolaters."

These doctrines have long since been abandoned in all the Reformed Churches on the Continent of Europe. They are now on trial in the Presbyterian Churches of the United States and Great Britain. A simultaneous movement has suddenly and independently broken out on both sides of the Atlantic, and is rapidly spreading among ministers and intelligent laymen, in favor of such a revision of the Westminster Confession as will relieve it of these offensive features, give greater prominence to the precious doctrine of God's love to all mankind, and express the living faith of the Church in the present age. I cannot but see in this movement the finger of God, who calls the Presbyterian Church to a higher, broader, and more liberal position in theory and practice. It is stronger than the reunion movement which, twenty years ago, melted the minds and hearts of the Old and New School into one communion, for greater and better work than they have ever done before.

Without entering into an argument,† I shall briefly present my objections to the doctrines of reprobation and preterition, and my reasons for a revision:

1. Supposing these doctrines were Scriptural, they are out of place in a public Confession of Faith, where they can do no possible good, but a great deal of harm. They ought to be left with other transcendent and ante-mundane mysteries to scientific and speculative theology, where they properly belong.

2. They are based upon a misunderstanding of a few obscure passages of the Bible, which nearly all modern exegetes of all schools explain differently and in harmony with the clear and undisputed teaching of Christ and the Apostles. St. Paul undoubtedly teaches Divine sovereignty in the ninth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans—the strong fortress of supralapsarianism—but in the tenth chapter he teaches as clearly human responsibility, and in the eleventh chapter the future conversion of "the fulness of the Gentiles" and of "all Israel;" and he winds up the discussion with that wonderful sentence which contains the ultimate solution of this mysterious problem (xi. 32): "God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all" [not "upon some," or "the elect only"]. Let us not stick in the darkness of the ninth, but go on to the glorious light of the eleventh chapter.

3. They are inconsistent with the whole spirit of the Gospel, which expressly and repeatedly teaches that God is love; that His love extends to all mankind; that He wills all men to be saved, and none to perish; that Christ is the Saviour of the race, and died not only for our sins, but for the sin of the whole world; that the Gospel is freely and sincerely offered to all men, and should be preached to every creature; that believers are saved by free grace, but the impenitent are lost by their own guilt. Compare John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 8, 16; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 John ii. 2, etc.

God's saving love in Christ to all mankind is the central truth of Christianity, and the very marrow of the Gospel, and ought to be the heart and soul of every true Confession of Faith. The older Calvinism exalts God's love to the elect, but "passes by the rest of mankind." It did little or nothing for the conversion of the heathen till the great missionary revival which inspires the churches of our age.

4. Foreordination of some men to everlasting life, and of others to everlasting death, and preterition of all the non-elect (including the whole heathen world), are equally inconsistent with a proper conception of divine justice, and pervert it into an arbitrary partiality for a small circle of the elect, and an arbitrary neglect of the great mass of men. Justice is strictly impartial, and adapts rewards and punishments to man's merits and opportunities. It is only by an indefinite extension of the decree of election beyond the limits of the visible Church, that Calvinism can be relieved of the charge of narrowness, and be measurably reconciled with the idea of Divine justice and wisdom; but the Westminster Confession gives the benefit of such extension only to elect infants dying in infancy, and to in-

---

* 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4. Paul speaks here of "a mystery of lawlessness" (ἀνομία) that was already at work in his own day (ver. 7). Whatever he meant by it, he could not mean the Pope, who did not yet exist, and who could hardly be charged with lawlessness, but rather with the very opposite—despotism. As to the term "Antichrist," it is only used by John, and he speaks of *many* Antichrists in his own day in Asia Minor, and characterizes them as false teachers who denied the incarnation (which the papacy never did).—1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3; 2 John vii.

† For a historical and doctrinal argument, the writer begs leave to refer to his article in the October number of "The Presbyterian Review."

capables, and denies it to all adults who are ignorant of Christianity, and profess any other religion, although they "frame their lives according to the light of nature."

5. These doctrines are not taught in the œcumenical creeds, nor in the older Reformed Confessions, with the exception of the Genevan Consensus (1552), the Lambeth Articles (1595), and the Irish Articles (1615), which documents never had much authority, and have long since gone out of use. Supralapsarianism represents only a theological *school* in the Reformed Church, and a very respectable one, but not the Church itself; it was, and should be tolerated, but it was not, and should not be, enjoined or imposed. It has, in my judgment, greater logical and speculative force than infralapsarianism; but it was always felt by the majority of Reformed divines, that by irresistible logic it makes God the author of sin and death, and that it would consistently lead to hopeless fatalism and pantheism, from which the supralapsarians themselves shrink back with horror. Hence nearly all the Confessions stop within the limits of infralapsarianism. Christian truth rises above the narrow limitations of logic and mathematics.

The Theses of Berne (1528), the First Confession of Basel (1532), the First Helvetic or Second Basel Confession (1536), the Geneva Catechism of Calvin (1545), the Gallican Confession (1559), the Belgic Confession (1561), the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), the First and Second Scotch Confessions (1560 and 1580), the Thirty-nine Articles (1571), and even the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1619), and the Shorter Westminster Catechism (1647),[*] are silent on the decree of reprobation and preterition, and confine themselves to the positive, undisputed, and most comforting doctrine of the election of believers by free grace to everlasting life.

And in the Westminster Assembly itself, several of the ablest men, as Calamy, Seaman, Arrowsmith, and Gataker, were opposed to the majority on those knotty points, and advocated what is called conditional universalism, *i.e.*, a sincere divine intention and provision for the salvation of *all* men.

6. These doctrines are no longer believed by the majority of Presbyterians, nor preached by any Presbyterian minister as far as I know.[*] They certainly could not be preached in any pulpit without emptying the pews. Presbyterian ministers, on the contrary, uniformly assume in their sermons the free and sincere offer of salvation to all men, and the sole responsibility of the sinner for rejecting the Gospel.

What cannot be preached in the Church and taught in the Sunday-school ought not to be put into a Confession of Faith, and imposed as a yoke upon the conscience of ministers and elders.

7. They obstruct the progress of the Presbyterian Church; they give aid and comfort to her enemies, and plausibility to their charges and misrepresentations; they have in times past driven away from the Confession a large party of English Presbyterians, New England Congregationalists, and the Cumberland Presbyterians, and they will in future prevent many promising students from entering the ministry, and intelligent laymen from serving as elders, so long as they are required to subscribe that document as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Bible." [†]

It is true this formula of subscription, as generally understood by ministers and elders, is fortunately very liberal, and gives a large margin for dissent. But if the word "system" is used in the strict sense, it is not applicable to the Bible at all; for the Bible contains an infinite variety of truths, and is as far above the narrow limitations of any particular or denominational system of human theology, as nature is above every system of natural philosophy, and history above the compends of historians. It would be better to abolish subscription altogether, or so to alter the Confession as to make it unobjectionable, so that subscription to it may be an act of cheerful and whole-hearted assent.

A revision would not be complete without striking out the incidental and unnecessary denunciation of the Pope as Antichrist, and of two hundred millions of professed worshippers of Christ as idolaters. Such a denunciation can be easily explained from the polemical heat and political complications of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but calmly viewed from the present stage of historical knowledge, the charge is untrue, unjust, uncharitable, and unchristian, as well as out of place in a religious creed; and no wise man or body of men would now venture to insert it.

---

[*] But the Larger Catechism agrees with the Confession and teaches that "God . . . has *passed by*, and *foreordained* the rest [*i.e.*, the non-elect] to *dishonor and wrath*, to be for their sin inflicted, to the praise of the glory of His justice." Qu. xiii.

[*] Dr. Cuyler of Brooklyn, an experienced Presbyterian pastor, goes much further, and asserts that "ninety-nine hundredths" do not believe these features of the Westminster Confession. See "The New York Evangelist" for Oct. 31, 1889. When Dr. Schaff read his more moderate statement in Presbytery, he asked the brethren present if any of them ever preached on the decree of reprobation and preterition, to contradict his assertion by rising; but no one rose. Silence gives consent.

[†] This is the subscription required of all church officers, ministers, ruling elders, and deacons, according to the *Form of Government*, chaps. xiii., xiv., and xv.

Princeton theology—especially Dr. Archibald Alexander and Dr. Charles Hodge—did the greatest service to the Presbyterian Church by liberalizing the Calvinistic theology. Dr. Hodge boldly opposed the uncharitable anti-popery fanaticism of his day, and maintained against the decision of the Old School General Assembly of 1845, the Church character of the Roman Catholic communion, and the validity of her baptism. It was an equally great service that the same honored and beloved divine (with whom I had a delightful personal acquaintance) obliterated the Westminster distinction between elect and reprobate infants, and taught the salvation of *all* infants dying in infancy.[*] This was an immense progress in the right direction, and gives the whole theology a more sweet, evangelical, and catholic tone.

Now is the providential occasion to proceed a step further, and to remove from the Confession itself those stumbling-blocks and burdens which are becoming more and more unbearable to a large number of conscientious and liberal-minded men.

If the Church refuses to make the reasonable changes demanded by many of her most loyal sons, she will virtually reindorse and deliberately profess before the world some of the worst features of the theology of the seventeenth century, which taught a close union of Church and State, justified the burning of Servetus,[†] and declared religious toleration to be a pernicious error, and a device of the devil.[‡]

The Confession has already been revised, in 1788 and 1888, in several important articles, bearing upon Church and State, and forbidden marriages, and it is all the better and more acceptable for these changes. It is not more difficult to remove reprobation and preterition, the damnation of the heathen, and the denunciation of Papists from the Confession, than it was a hundred years ago to reconstruct chap. xx. 4, xxiii. 3, xxxi. 1, 2, in favor of the doctrine of separation of Church and State, which the Westminster Assembly, itself the creature of the State and responsible to it, would have indignantly rejected as a dangerous heresy and downright political atheism. Why then not make these further changes and save the life and usefulness of a venerable document for other generations?

Or if this cannot be done without mutilating the document, then in humble reliance upon the Holy Ghost, who is ever guiding the Church, let us take the more radical step, with or through the Pan-Presbyterian Council, of preparing a brief, simple, and popular creed, which shall clearly and tersely express for laymen as well as ministers only the cardinal doctrines of faith and duty, leaving metaphysics and polemics to scientific theology; a creed that can be subscribed, taught, and preached *ex animo,* without any mental reservation, or any unnatural explanation; a creed that is full of the marrow of the gospel of God's infinite love in Christ for the salvation of the world.

Such a consensus-creed would be a bond of union between the different branches of the Reformed Church in Europe and America and in distant mission fields, and prepare the way for a wider union with other Evangelical Churches. It ought not to contradict the Westminster Confession, but retain its best features, and supplement it by those truths of the Scriptures which are now made most vital and important in the mind of the Church, and best calculated to promote its mission at home and abroad.

The Congregationalists in America made a new creed of Twelve Articles in 1883,[*] and the English Presbyterians made one of Twenty-four Articles in 1888;[†] both are thoroughly evangelical, and skilfully avoid all the knotty and disputed points of the scholastic Calvinism of a by-gone age. The Presbyterian Church of the United States, with or without the co-operation of the Pan-Presbyterian Council, has sufficient wisdom, learning, and piety to produce a creed to suit her wants.

In conclusion: I am in favor of both a revision of the Westminster Confession by the General Assembly, and an œcumenical Reformed Consensus to be prepared by the Pan-Presbyterian Council. If we cannot have both, let us at least have one of the two, and I shall be satisfied with either.

---

[*] Dr. Shedd also, while he still teaches *reprobation* and *preterition* as a necessary part of Calvinistic theology, agrees with Princeton, whether logically or illogically, in extending election to *all* infants dying in infancy, and to *some* adults among the heathen. A very important concession.

[†] It is well known that Calvin himself wrote a special defence of the execution of the unfortunate Spaniard; and he can only be justified for his share in the tragedy on the ground that he regarded it his solemn duty to God and the Church to act as he did.

[‡] This was the view even of the venerable and liberal Richard Baxter, and of the New England Puritans in the days of expelling Baptists, hanging Quakers, and burning witches. If American Protestants abhor anything, it is the principle and practice of religious persecution; and yet it is inseparable from a strict construction of the union of Church and State such as was maintained by the Westminster Assembly in common with all State churches or churches established by law.

[*] Printed in Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. III., p. 910 seq., Fourth Edition, 1884.

[†] Published in "The N. Y. Evangelist" for Oct. 31, 1889.

Something must and will be done to bring the Presbyterian Standards into harmony with the living Church of to-day, and to make them a potent factor for the great work of the reunion of Christendom.

STAMPING OUT PROTESTANTISM IN RUSSIA.*

BY CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.

From *The Nineteenth Century*, London, December, 1889.

THE efforts put forth since the accession of Nicholas to the throne of Russia to Russify the Baltic Provinces are daily assuming more and more the character not only of a political, but also of a religious persecution.

These provinces have been in the possession of Russia for scarcely more than a century. Christianity was introduced there from Western Europe in 1172. At the Reformation era the reformed faith won the day after a short but decisive struggle, and Lutheranism has been ever since the common creed of the peoples of the provinces, although composed of various races and nationalities.

Esthonia and Livonia were ceded to Russia in consequence of the victories of Peter the Great, but by the peace of Nystädt the Lutheran Church was confirmed in all its privileges as the Established Church of those provinces. Kurland obtained similar terms from the Empress Catherine, when that province, in 1795, voluntarily submitted to her sway.

In defiance of those solemn covenants the Emperor Nicholas promulgated a new code of ecclesiastical law in 1832, whereby the Greek Church formally became the Established Church, and the provisions of the Russian penal code became applicable to the provinces. But inasmuch as it was impossible to put such provisions in force in a country where all, both nobles and peasants, were, almost without exception, Protestants, it was fondly hoped that the new law would become practically a *brutum fulmen*, and that no real harm would be done to the Protestant Church.

When a Greek bishopric was established in Riga in 1837 the authorities took due care to explain, that by the erection of the see nothing was intended contrary to the interests of the Protestant religion. The worthlessness of Russian imperial promises was, however, soon only too manifest. A series of bad harvests in 1839, 1840, and 1841 created great distress among the peasantry, and a state of famine prevailed in the Baltic Provinces in 1844 and 1845. Russian agents traversed the country in order to stir up the peasantry against the landowners, who were mostly of German origin. Those agents represented to the peasants that if they would outwardly conform to the Russian Church they would be placed in a position independent of the proprietors. The peasants were assured that if they only placed their names on the Greek registers they would be allowed freely to retain their churches, sermons, sacraments, and Bibles, while they would be freed from the necessity of paying tithes to the German pastors. Greater religious liberty was promised to them than had ever been enjoyed in the bosom of the Lutheran Church. Greek priests were at the same time ostentatiously permitted by Bishop Philaret to read from the pulpits Protestant sermons, and Greek churches were even granted occasionally for Moravian services. But all this liberty was but a bait to induce the ignorant peasants to place their names on the Greek registers.* By the law of Russia no one who becomes a member of the Greek Church is permitted, on any pretext whatever, to secede from her communion.

The Russian propagandists had recourse

---

* *Die Bedrückung der Deutschen und die Entrechtung der protestantischen Kirche in den Ostsee-Provinzen.* Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1886.—*Russisch-baltische Blätter*, Heft i.-iv. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1886–88.—*Die Vergewaltigung der russischen Ostsee-Provinzen.* Appell an das Ehrgefühl des Protestantismus von einem Balten. Berlin: A. Deubner, 1886.—*Die baltische Provinzen Russlands.* Politische und culturgeschichtliche Aufsätze. Von Julius Eckhart. 2 Aufl. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1869.—*Livländische Beitrage*, herausgegeben von W. von Bock. Band I. (2 parts), 1867–68; Band II. (7 parts), 1868–69; Neue Folge, Band I., Heft i.-v., with supplement, 1869–71. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot.—*Geschichtsbilder aus der Lutherischen Kirche Livlands vom Jahre* 1845 *an.* Von Dr. G. C. Adolf von Harless. 2 Aufl. Leipzig, 1869.—*Die lettisch-nationale Bewegung und die kurländische Geistlichkeit.* Eine unparteiische Stimme aus den Ostsee-Provinzen. Leipzig: Böhme, 1886. — *Verfassungsgeschichte der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Russland.* Von Dr. Hermann Dalton. Gotha: Perthes, 1887.—*Im Banne Moskaus. Die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche in den russischen Ostsee-Provinzen.* Von Dr. K. H. Neubert. Barmen: Klein, 1888.—*Russland am Scheidewege.* Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Slavophilenthums und zur Beurtheilung seiner Politik. Berlin: Wilhelmi. 1888.—*Deutsch-protestantische Kämpfe in den baltischen Provinzen Russlands.* Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1888. *Zur Gewissensfreiheit in Russland.* Offenes Sendschreiben an den Oberprokureur des russischen Synods, Herrn Wirklichen Geheimrat K. Pobedonoszeff von Hermann Dalton. 7ter Abdruck. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1889.

* These statements can be abundantly proved by a reference to the mass of depositions on the subject sworn before the courts of the provinces, which are given in the work of von Harless and in the larger book of von Bock, entitled *Livländische Beiträge*, published from 1867 to 1871. The "Leaves from the Diary of a Russian Official in Riga, 1846" (given in full in chapter iv. of the *Deutsch protestantische Kämpfe in den baltischen-Provinzen*) recounts a number of cases in which the Lutheran clergy were harassed by the police. Several pastors were deprived of their benefices and punished in various ways. Evangelical publications were suppressed and confiscated. Rewards were liberally bestowed on all officials who exhibited zeal in the work of "conversion." Greek churches were, in several cases, erected on farms in spite of the protests of the landowners. Protestants were compelled to uncover their heads and pay honour to Greek processions, and in other ways molested in their conscientious opposition to the inroads of the Greek Church.

to even worse methods. Memorials to the Czar, drawn up in Russian, and purporting to be memorials for an extension of civil rights, were extensively signed by the peasants who were wholly ignorant of that language. The memorials ultimately proved to be petitions for enrolment as members of the Greek Church. The memorialists were informed in due course by the bishop that the Czar had graciously acceded to their request, and that they had been duly enrolled as Greek Catholics. All protests were in vain. Many were forcibly baptized and anointed. The names of others were in many cases inserted on the church registers as "anointed" and "confirmed," although they had not actually undergone those rites. Russian law assigns a certain period for due consideration before converts are received into the Greek Church. But the provision was set at nought, and no legal permission has ever since been accorded to those who were then so foully betrayed for reinstating themselves in their proper position as members of the Lutheran Church.

No doubt large numbers were, in the period referred to, induced, by promises of secular advantages, to join the Greek Church. But many cases of cruel wrong were done in entire violation of the rights of conscience. The enrolment of a father in a state of intoxication legally transferred in some cases his wife, and in all cases his children under age, to the registers of the Greek communion.

It is not surprising that such a propaganda should have had considerable success. The success would not, however, have proved so considerable had it not been for the estrangement which existed between the peasantry and the nobles. Though the peasants and nobles were united in a common adherence to the Protestant faith, the German nobles were accustomed to look down upon the people whom their forefathers had conquered as inferior races fit only for serfdom, while the conquered races in return regarded the nobles as their oppressors. The clergy, with noble exceptions, were too much imbued with the feelings of the nationality from whence they had sprung, and agrarian disputes embittered the relations between the peasants and the landed proprietors.

The education of the peasantry had been too generally neglected in the days of quiet; although extensive efforts were set on foot in 1830 and in 1846 to improve the education and to enlarge the privileges of the peasant population. It would have been easy in the previous decades to have thoroughly Germanised the original races had that task then been undertaken. But the opportunity was let slip, and the Russian Government now sought to Russify the peasantry. It is undeniable, too, that its efforts were attended with a certain amount of success.

But the peasantry awoke at last to a comprehension of the real position of affairs. They discovered that they had been duped, and that the civil and religious liberty promised to them was a delusion. They strove in vain to shake off their connection with the Greek Church. They flocked in troops back to their old churches, and implored the Lutheran pastors to reinstate their names again on the Protestant registers. But, willing as the pastors were to readmit "backsliders" to their communion, the laws of the Russian Empire forbade such a return. Lutherans are, in Russia, permitted freely to pass over to the ranks of "the Orthodox," but the Russian Church permits no "apostates" from her communion. The "character" she imparts by the "anointing oil" is considered to be as "indelible" as "holy orders." Unbelievers may remain even as "atheists" "within" the Russian Church, but no one is permitted to "go forth" from her fold. The statement of Prince Tscherkasky at the Slavonic Congress in Moscow in 1869 cannot be forgotten: "I prefer a thousand times rather an orthodox Greek atheist than a believing Roman Catholic." The statement affords the key to understand Russian policy.

Petitions upon petitions from the injured peasantry now poured in upon the authorities. Those petitions described the artifices by which the poor peasants had been beguiled. The "exceeding bitter cry" which arose from the cottage to the noble's hall, and echoed from the hall to the throne, was too loud to be wholly disregarded. Alexander the Second was constrained to make inquiry into the matter, and General Count Bobrinski was commissioned, in 1863, to visit the Baltic Provinces, and to report on the subject to the Emperor.

Count Bobrinski's official report, dated April 18, 1864, was a terrible justification of the grievances complained of. According to that report, out of the whole number of 140,000 persons, entered upon the registers of the Greek Church as converts, scarcely one-tenth really belonged to that communion. All the rest in heart and soul still continued to be members of the Lutheran Church. The report closed with the words:—

> Your Majesty, it has been painful to me, as Orthodox and as a Russian, to witness with my own eyes

the degradation of the Russian Orthodoxy through the public exposure of this official fraud. It is not the earnest words of these unhappy families, who turn themselves to your Majesty with the humble but impassioned prayer to grant them the right to confess the religion which is in accordance with the conviction of their own conscience, not those open-hearted and touching expressions of their feelings, which have made so painful an impression on me, as this fact in particular—that the violence done to conscience, and the official fraud, which is known to all, should be indissolubly connected with the thought of Russia and Orthodoxy.

The report of Count Bobrinski brought a little relief to the harassed provinces. The "converts" were not, indeed, permitted openly to return to the Church of their forefathers. But the legal proceedings against most of them were tacitly dropped for a season. Bishop Philaret was translated to another diocese, and his successor, who was created Archbishop of Riga, was not at first disposed to carry matters with so high a hand. The new archbishop, however, was not willing to grant religious liberty to the oppressed; he merely sought to postpone the matter. He admitted that many names had been unfairly placed upon the registers of his church. But even in such cases he refused to concede liberty of conscience, lest the conclusion should be drawn that secession was, under any circumstances, permitted from the Greek communion.*

The persecution of the Lutherans in the Baltic Provinces was for many years not generally known to their co-religionists in the more favoured countries of Europe. Christians in England, under the guidance of the Evangelical Alliance (founded in 1846), had their attention directed to various religious persecutions in Florence and other parts of Italy, in Spain, in Germany, and in Turkey, long before the cry of oppression was heeded which arose from the Baltic Provinces. In 1870 the Evangelical Alliance took up at last the case of the Baltic Provinces, and an international deputation was sent to the Emperor of Russia. A memorial to the Emperor was with difficulty presented through the medium of Prince Gortschakoff, and the fair words spoken by the Prince on that occasion gave some reason to hope that an increased modicum of religious liberty would be granted to the sorely harassed Lutherans of those provinces.

With the presentation, however, of the memorial, and the publication of an account of the "gracious" manner in which it had been received, all efforts of the Alliance in that direction came to an end. No sufficient means were taken to discover the actual results brought about by the "memorial" in the provinces themselves. The "intelligence" department of the Evangelical Alliance has never been really "up to the mark," and Russian policy was not easily turned aside from its fixed purpose of the Russification of the provinces.

It reads almost as a satire on the impotent efforts of the Evangelical Alliance to know now that the very year in which Prince Gortschakoff gave such a "gracious" reply, a society was actually founded in Russia, under Imperial patronage, for the express purpose of converting the Lutherans to the Orthodox faith. Had that society sought to accomplish its purpose by a use of all the arts of persuasion and controversy, no one would have a right to complain. But the objects of the society were mainly political; it carried on its propaganda by means of agencies similar to those already described, while it was backed by the power of the Russian Empire. Yet, active as were its operations, nothing was heard of its doings by the English Evangelical Alliance for nearly fifteen years!

With the accession of Alexander the Third a new chapter of religious persecution has been opened. The sad circumstances under which the present monarch commenced his reign were not such as to render him favourably disposed to any movements in the direction of liberty. And owing to the severity of the present persecution the days of Alexander the Second are now looked back upon as a time of comparative peace.

In the Baltic Provinces Lutheran pastors, however anxious they may be to confine their ministrations to persons of their own communion, are often placed under the greatest difficulties. No inconsiderable number of the so-called "converts" have naturally persisted in attendance at Lutheran services. Many, too, of those who, through fear, for a time conformed to the Greek Church, have been driven back by their consciences into the Protestant churches. Many also contrived to conceal a "conversion" of which they were ashamed, and in no few cases managed to retain their names upon the Protestant registers. Consequently not only were those earnest pastors, who felt constrained to "obey God rather than man," brought into constant collision with the Russian ecclesiastical authorities, but many others who might have been disposed to temporise have also fallen under the condemnation of the Russian penal code. The best course, and possibly the safest in the end, would have been boldly to defy the law and to brave persecution. But it is not surprising that persons situated in such trying circumstances should have in many cases attempted to elude the law by other less honourable contrivances.

---

* Special negotiations were carried on with Archbishop Platon on behalf of ninety-eight persons who claimed their liberty as having been falsely enrolled. Out of that small number fifty-six persons were, in opposition to their solemn protests, declared by him to be members of the Greek Church, and the police authorities were directed to compel the attendance of those persons at the Greek services.

But as in the fable, the wolf, in order to justify his intended slaughter, complained loudly of the misdeeds of the lamb, so there have not been lacking writers who in the present crisis have sought to paint Russia in the character of a generous benefactor, anxious only to deliver the peasantry of the provinces from the power of a rapacious nobility. But if the full history of the facts were known, the fullest sympathy of all Englishmen would be accorded to the suffering Protestants of the Baltic Provinces.

The intolerant and persecuting spirit which now characterises Russian rule in these provinces may be seen by the statement of a few facts.

In March, 1886, the Minister of the Interior issued an order to the police to prevent persons not belonging to the Greek Church from using chaplets of flowers at funerals. Those who are acquainted with Continental habits know that the custom of depositing garlands on the coffin and of throwing flowers into the grave is more common than in our country. Much indignation has been created by such a wanton interference with a harmless custom; and one can scarcely be surprised at the anger created among the bystanders when the police have on several occasions required the coffins to be taken up from the grave in order to despoil them of the last fond tokens of love and respect. Even when committing the remains of their friends to the tomb, Protestants must be taught to feel their inferiority to members of the Orthodox Church! And this in countries where less than twenty years ago Protestantism was supreme, and where even still Protestant pastors are recognised by the law!

A beginning has already been made with the appropriation of churches erected for Protestant worship for the purposes of the Greek Church. When a petition was sent to St. Petersburg complaining of such injustice, the first person who headed the list of petitioners was immured for some time in the casemates of the Imperial Palace at St. Petersburg. No Lutheran churches are in future to be built, unless permission is specially granted by the Orthodox clergy; while the Greek clergy have obtained the right to allocate any sites they may choose for the erection of Greek churches and schools, without the consent of the landowners.

The visit of Bishop Donat to Palzmar in June 1885 was attended with some remarkable circumstances. The Bishop was met by a large crowd of "converts," who implored him to permit them openly to profess the Protestant religion which they held, and to allow their names to be struck off the Greek registers, inasmuch as in heart and soul they were in reality Lutherans. They explained to the bishop that their names had been placed on the registers of the Greek Church by the fault of their parents, or through their own ignorance. The bishop refused to listen to their entreaties, and informed them that if they persisted in harassing him by such requests, he would have their clergyman, Pastor Brandt, removed from office, and thus the parish would be deprived altogether of a Protestant pastor. The peasants boldly replied that they could read the Word of God for themselves, and, if their pastor were removed, they would form themselves into a Lutheran society, and select some man of their own number acquainted with the Bible to preach to them and to administer the Lord's Supper.

Among the petitioners on that occasion was a Lettish peasant woman, Anna Kursemneeks by name, thirty-two years old, who had originally been baptized in the Lutheran Church. The name of Anna and that of her sister had been placed upon the Greek registers in consequence of her father having been enrolled and "confirmed" as a Greek Catholic during the excitement of the former years. Anna implored the bishop with tears to be permitted to remain in the Church of her forefathers. Instead of replying to her request, the bishop presented her with the picture of a saint, and directed her to pray to the Virgin Mary. She refused the picture, stating that she believed Christ to be the only mediator between God and man. Several priests who were with the bishop urged her to accept the holy picture, for the bishop would then give her absolution. She replied that the bishop had no power to forgive sins, for he was but man and not God, and stated that the Lutheran pastor only ventured to declare that pardon came from God. Some Greek bystanders then called her a great sinner. She replied that she knew that very well, but that Christ pardoned sinners and not Pharisees. She was then threatened with the Czar's displeasure, but nobly answered that the Emperor might take away her life, but that he could not rob her of her faith.

On the 26th of July, 1885, an Imperial ukase was issued threatening severe measures against all "converts" who dared to return to Lutheranism. A petition was at once sent in to the Czar, signed by Anna Kursemneeks and her sister and two men of Palzmar, named Leitis and Ohsol. The petition is given in full in the *Russischbaltische Blätter*, Heft III., and in Dr. Neubert's interesting little work. Its language might well have touched the heart of the mighty Czar; the Emperor, in all probability, never saw it. But the answer came in the shape of police domiciliary visits. Pastor Brandt and his schoolmaster Abel, who were suspected of having a hand in the affair, were thrown into the criminal prison of Riga, and Anna Kursemneeks had to undergo a rigorous examination, followed by a short imprisonment.

When interrogated and asked how she dared to send such a petition to the Czar, the woman replied that she was wont to ask God daily for all that she needed, and that therefore she considered she might ask His representative on earth for what he could grant her. When it was objected to her that she subscribed herself as a "most obedient subject," and yet had ventured to disobey the Czar by abandoning the Greek Church, she replied, "I am prepared to give up to the Czar all he demands—even my life; but my heart and my faith I cannot yield to him, for these I must give to God only."

In March 1886 sentence was passed on Pastor Brandt. He was deprived of his pastorate and banished to Smolensk. There he was placed under police surveillance, was permitted to work for 2½*d.* a day, but not allowed to preach or teach. His heroic wife soon joined him in his punishment. The case, after some time, aroused much sympathy in St. Petersburg, and he has recently been permitted to accept a small pastorate in the interior. Jacob Abel, the schoolmaster, was deposed from office, and declared "a politically untrustworthy person," and incapable of holding any office as teacher, or even as sexton. The only offence laid to his charge has been that of opposing the propaganda of the Greek Church.

Sixty-five pastors have been already prosecuted before the courts of Livonia on the charges (1) of having administered the Lord's Supper to persons who had been enrolled on the Greek registers, and (2) of having performed marriages between Lutherans and members of the Greek Church. All persons whose names are, however wrongly, on the Greek registers are legally regarded as Greek Catholics. In most of these cases the courts of the province returned a verdict of "not proven." The Imperial prosecutor appealed to the Supreme Court of Russia, that is, the Senate in St. Petersburg. The Senate have already condemned Pastor Christoph, of St. Johannis, in Esthonia, to a year's banishment to Astrachan, and Pastor Hoerschelmann, of Haggers, in Esthonia, to banishment to Eastern Siberia, though the latter has been recommended by the Senate to the Imperial clemency.

The Senate of St. Petersburg has lately expressed its opinion that the Church law in the provinces is too weak to meet the exigencies of the present situation. In a ukase of January 28, 1888, issued in the case of Pastor Emil Wegener, of Ecks, and other accused pastors of Livonia, the Senate has asked the Imperial Government for further powers in order to secure the condemnation of the offending pastors. By the law of 1832 all offences committed by the clergy must first be brought before the Church courts or consistories. Those courts, as well as the ordinary courts of the provinces, have proved too favourably disposed to the accused pastors. Hence it has been decided to dissolve all the consistories throughout the Baltic Provinces, and a beginning is to be made with the consistories of Riga, Reval, and Arensburg. The criminal courts, too, have also been partially reconstructed; and in all cases in which clerical offences are to be tried it has been decided that the officials, from the judge down to the lowest officer, must be members of the Orthodox Church.

The Russian Governor of Livonia, Michael Sinowjeff, in an official letter to Bishop Donat, dated February, 1887, states that in future all cases of "apostasy" from the Orthodox Church will be severely punished. "Converts" who attend the instructions of a Lutheran pastor are to be ineligible for any post under Government. They are to be liable to imprisonment; their children may be taken away from them and handed over to members of the Orthodox communion to be brought up as Greek Catholics. Such guardians will also be liable to severe punishment if they fail to impart the necessary training in the Greek faith to all children committed to their care. Heavier punishments are to be meted out to "converts" who venture to get married in Lutheran churches. All such marriages are declared to be illegal; the offspring of such marriages are to be regarded as illegitimate, and incapable of inheriting the property of their parents. Imprisonment, from eight to ten months, is to be the penalty of any such persons as venture to train up their children in the Lutheran faith.

Such is "civil and religious liberty" in the Baltic Provinces of Russia! It is no wonder that the International Committee of the Evangelical Alliance, at its meeting at Geneva, determined to memorialise the Emperor of Russia on the subject; and a memorial signed by the presidents and secretaries of its various branches was duly forwarded to his Majesty in August, 1887.

In January, 1888, a remarkable answer was received to this communication. The answer was addressed to M. Edward Naville, the eminent Egyptologist, President of the Swiss Central Committee of the Evangelical Alliance. The answer was not sent from the Cabinet of the Czar, but was signed by Konstantin Pobedonoszeff, chief Procurator of the Holy Synod of the Russian Church. This remarkable man was formerly tutor to the present Emperor. He is the author of a work in several volumes on Russian jurisprudence, and the translator into Russian of Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ.* His piety was strikingly displayed in his earnest *Appeal to the Russian Youth,* written on the occasion of the murder of the Emperor Alexander the Second. But alas! M. Pobedonoszeff has, by his actions, and by his letters on the question of the Baltic Provinces, proved himself to be a bigoted Greek Catholic, and utterly unable to comprehend the very first principles of religious liberty. His letter to M. Naville is an impeachment of the Baltic pastors and of the German nobility, in which facts and fictions are curiously blended together. He accuses the Lutheran clergy of bigotry towards the Greek communion, because they are opposed to the doctrines of that Church. But he forgets "the beam that is in his own eye." He denies that freedom of conscience is interfered with in Russia, in which empire he asserts that all creeds are perfectly free, "*if only they abstain from proselytising.*" M. Pobedonoszeff cannot comprehend the fundamental truth, that what he calls "freedom" falls infinitely short of what is really meant by the term, and that as long as the Russian law attempts forcibly to restrain men within the pale of the Russian Church, or to prevent persons who have passed over from any cause to the Greek Church returning to the Church from whence they originally seceded, there is no such thing as real religious liberty in the Russian Empire.

Dr. Hermann Dalton, late pastor at St. Petersburg, has issued a reply to M. Pobedonoszeff. He comments on the unfairness with which the press of the provinces has been muzzled, while gross libels are published upon the Protestant clergy and nobility of those lands. M. Pobedonoszeff insinuated that the clergy were seeking to stir up their people against Russia. Dr. Dalton challenges him to produce one single instance of their disloyalty. One paragraph tending in that direction, cited by the Russian official, Dr. Dalton points out never appeared in the sermon incriminated, but was quoted from a review of that sermon by the Russian journalist Katkoff. The Protestants of the Baltic Provinces have freely shed their blood for Russia on many a hard-fought battle-field. In speaking of the schools of the provinces, Dr. Dalton shows from official statistics how far they surpass all those of the other parts of the Russian Empire. He quotes even Katkoff in their favour, who wrote as follows: "Russia will, no doubt, give its utmost support to the German customs and German culture in those lands. God preserves us from the vandalism of destroying a school system based upon the foundation common to all civilised nations! God forbid that we should bring down the gymnasia of the provinces to the sad level of our educational establishments! May the instruction both in the gymnasia and in the university continue in the German language. A protest against that arrangement would, indeed, proceed on our side from veritably false national pride, from which, thank God, we are free."

Dr. Dalton does not enter into many details of the persecution. He quotes the anathemas against Protestantism uttered by Archbishop Platon; he exposes the manner in which M. Pobedonoszeff seeks to ignore the official report of Count Bobrinski. He refers to the suppression of the Protestant missionary work carried on in the Caucasus and elsewhere, which has not been taken up by the Russian Church. He shows from M. Pobedonoszeff's own report in 1884, not only that converts have fallen back into Mohammedanism, but that numbers of Russian Christians have there apostatised from Christianity without any let or hindrance being placed in their way. He exposes severely the fact, that while Mohammedan works against Christianity, and even in favour of a "Holy War" against Christians, are permitted by Russian censorship to be printed in the University Press at Kasan, Protestant books are suppressed in the Baltic Provinces. Step by step he goes through the letter of the Russian advocate of persecution, and closes a letter of over ninety octavo pages by giving sad instances in which the suppression of the rights of conscience has driven some to despair and infidelity.

A translation of the letter of M. Pobedonoszeff appeared in the *Times* of May 26, 1888. It was also inserted in *Evangelical Christendom* of June, 1888. Little notice, however, has been called to that reply by the British Evangelical Alliance. That society has found it, no doubt, far easier to attend to other work than to attempt to call attention to the case of their suffering brethren in the Baltic Provinces. Meanwhile the English Church, in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury, has recently sent kind and flattering messages of love to the persecuting Church of Russia, while it has not uttered a syllable of remonstrance with respect to the cruel deeds done to a sister Protestant communion. Possibly the Archbishop of Canterbury has no acquaintance with the facts mentioned in our article. But it is one of the first duties of a society like the Evangelical Alliance to see that the English public is duly informed from time to time on all such matters. It may be able to do no more, but it ought to make strenuous efforts at least to perform this duty.

The Russian Church has often been unfairly accused of being opposed to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. But the Russian Church has in this particular of late nobly done her duty. Information of a certain kind travels slowly, even in our days, and often fails to find an attentive public. But the fact referred to is now becoming more generally known, and many people have come to the conclusion that there is "religious liberty" in Russia, and that the struggle in the Baltic Provinces is purely, or mainly, political. Religious liberty, however, in the proper sense of the word, is utterly unknown in Russia. No such liberty can exist where the right of spreading one's religious convictions is denied, and where no secession is permitted from an established Church. Russia is engaged in an attempt to "stamp out" Protestantism in the Baltic Provinces.

Though little has appeared in the columns of the daily press, the Baltic Provinces are wrapped in the flames of a ruthless persecution. The persecution may have a political object in view, but it is no less religious. We have not told the whole, or the half, of the story. Powerful efforts are put forth to destroy the Protestant schools. Those schools, built and maintained at the cost of the German communities, are now forced to adopt the Russian language as the medium of instruction. Religious instruction in the Protestant faith is interfered with. The pastors are not permitted to teach doctrines opposed to the teaching of the Greek Church. No warning voice is to be lifted against the practices of that Church, though those practices are in many particulars opposed to the tenets of all the Protestant communions, the Church of England included. We cannot enter into details on these heads. The gymnasia, once the pride of the provinces, are more than threatened. The University of Dorpat is to be completely Russified. Personal political liberty is at an end, as well as religious liberty. Englishmen may not be able to afford much assistance to the sufferers, but at least they ought to understand the true state of the case. It is, however, difficult to get at the history of facts. It is well known in Sweden, that a young man who attended the conference of the Young Men's Christian Association held last year in Stockholm, and spoke about the sufferings of his co-religionists in the Baltic Provinces, was arrested on his return home, and transported to Siberia. Such cases are not permitted to be mentioned in the public press. The newspapers of the provinces are under strict supervision : the courts do their work quietly ; private correspondence, as we know from practical experience, is being strictly watched by the police, and many avenues of information once open are now closed. The Russian police and officials are vigorously at work to destroy the highest civilisation found in the Russian Empire, and to bury it, and the Protestantism which gave it birth, in one common grave.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the above was written the *Times* of November 16 has published the following important intelligence :—

"The Czar has granted three months of unsolicited leave of absence to M. Pobedonoszeff, the Procurator-General of the Holy Russian Synod."

The *Times'* correspondent states further that the Czar during his recent stay at Copenhagen received Dr. Dalton's pamphlet, and learned therefrom something of the religious oppression in the Baltic Provinces. On his return to Russia the Emperor wrote an autograph letter to M. Pobedonoszeff, giving him three months' leave, and directing him to make use of the time in writing "a full and convincing answer" to Dr. Dalton's work. In vain has the Procurator-General sought for a private audience with his Majesty. The audience has been refused until the justificatory memoir shall have been handed in. These facts give much reason to hope for the dawn of better things, even in the oppressed Baltic Provinces.

THE DELUGE—BIBLICAL AND GEOLOGICAL.

BY PRINCIPAL SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D.

From *The Contemporary Review*, London, December, 1889.

To those whose memories can go back for half a century, more or less, the story of the deluge, old though it is, has passed through a variety of phases like the changes of a kaleidoscope, and which may afford an instructive illustration of the modifications of belief in other and some of them to us more important matters, whether of history or of religion, which have presented themselves in like varied aspects and may be variously viewed in the future.

As children we listened with awe and wonder to the story of the wicked antediluvians, and of their terrible fate and the salvation of righteous Noah, and received a deep and abiding impression of the enormity of moral evil and of the just retribution of the Great Ruler of the Universe. A little later, though the idea that all the fossil remains imbedded in the rocks are memorials of the deluge had passed away from the minds of the better informed, we read with interest the wonderful revelations of the bone-caves described by Buckland, and felt that the antediluvian age had become a scientific reality. But later still all this seemed to pass away like a dream. Under the guidance of Lyell we learned that even the caves and gravels must be of greater age than the historical deluge, and that the remains of men and animals contained in them must have belonged to far-off æons, antedating perhaps even the biblical creation of man; while the historical deluge, if it ever occurred, must have been an affair so small and local that it had left no traces on the rocks of the earth. At the same time biblical critics were busy with the narrative itself, showing that it could be decomposed into different documents, that it bore traces of a very recent origin, that it was unhistorical, and to be relegated to the same category with the fairy tales of our infancy. Again, however, the kaleidoscope turns, and the later researches of geology into the physical and human history of the more recent deposits of the earth's crust, the discoveries of ancient Assyrian or Chaldean records of the deluge, and the comparison of these with the ancient history of other nations, rehabilitate the old story; and as we study the new facts respecting the so-called palæolithic and neolithic men, the clay tablets recovered from the libraries of Nineveh by George Smith, the calculations of Prestwich and others respecting the recency of the glacial period, and the historical gatherings of Lenormant, we find ourselves drifting back to the faith of our childhood, or may congratulate ourselves on having adhered to it all along, even when the current of opinion tended strongly to turn us away. In illustration of the present aspects of the question I make two extracts, one from Lenormant's "Beginnings of History," another from a recent work of my own:

> "We are [says Lenormant] in a position to affirm that the account of the deluge is an universal tradition in all branches of the human family, with the sole exception of the black race. And a tradition everywhere so exact and so concordant cannot possibly be referred to an imaginary myth. No religious or cosmogonic myth possesses this character of universality. It must necessarily be the reminiscence of an actual and terrible event, which made so powerful an impression upon the imaginations of the first parents of our species that their descendants could never forget it. This cataclysm took place near the primitive cradle of mankind, and previous to the separation of the families from whom the principal races were to descend, for it would be altogether contrary to probability and to the laws of sound criticism to admit that local phenomena exactly similar in character could have been reproduced at so many different points on the globe as would enable one to explain these universal traditions, or that these traditions should always have assumed an identical form, combined with circumstances which need not necessarily have suggested themselves to the mind in such a connection." *

On the geological side, the following may be accepted as a summary of facts: †

> "If the earliest men were those of the river gravels and caves, men of the Mammoth age or of the palæolithic or palæocosmic period, we can form some definite ideas as to their possible antiquity. They colonized the continents immediately after the elevation of the land from the great subsidence which closed the pleistocene or glacial period, or in what has been called the 'continental' period of the post-glacial age, because the new lands then raised out of the sea exceeded in extent those which we now have. We have some measures of the date of this great continental elevation. Many years ago, Sir Charles Lyell used the recession of the Falls of Niagara as a chronometer, estimating their cutting power as equal to one foot per annum. He calculated the beginning of the process, which dates from the post-glacial elevation, to be about thirty thousand years ago. More recent surveys have shown that the rate is three times as great as that estimated by Lyell, and also that a considerable part of the gorge was merely cleaned out by the river since the pleistocene age. In this way the age of the Niagara gorge becomes reduced to perhaps seven or eight thousand years. Other indications of similar bearing are found both in Europe and America, and lead to the belief that it is physically impossible that man could have colonized the northern hemisphere at an earlier date. These facts render necessary an entire revision of the calculations based on the growth of stalagmite in caves

---

* "Les Origines de l'Histoire." Brown's translation.

† "Modern Science in Bible Lands," pp. 244–45; 251–52.

and other uncertain data which have been held to indicate a greater lapse of time.

> "If we identify the antediluvians of Genesis with the oldest men known to geological and archæological science, the parallelism is somewhat marked in physical characteristics and habits of life, and also in their apparently sudden and tragical disappearance from Europe and Western Asia, along with several of the large mammalia which were their contemporaries. If the deluge is to be accepted as historical, and if a similar great break interrupts the geological history of man, separating extinct races from those which still survive, why may we not correlate the two? If the deluge was misused in the early history of geology, by employing it to account for changes which took place long before the advent of man, this should not cause us to neglect its legitimate uses, with reference to the early human period. It is evident that if this correlation be accepted as probable, it must modify many views now held as to the antiquity of man. In that case the modern gravels and silts, spread over the plateaus between the river valleys, will be accounted for, not by any greater overflow of the existing streams, but by the abnormal action of currents of water diluvial in their character. Further, since the historical deluge must have been of very limited duration, the physical changes separating the deposits containing the remains of palæocosmic men from those of later date would in like manner be accounted for not by the slow processes imagined by extreme uniformitarians, but by causes of a more abrupt and cataclysmic character."[*]

We may proceed to inquire as to whether the position which we have now reached is likely to be permanent, or may represent merely one shifting phase of opinion. For this purpose we may formulate these conclusions in a few general statements, merely referring to the evidence on which they are based, as any complete discussion of this would necessarily be impossible within the limits of this article. We may first summarize the present position of the matter as indicated by historical and scientific research altogether independently of the Bible.

1. The recent discovery of the Chaldean deluge tablets has again directed attention to the statements of Berosus respecting the Babylonian tradition of a great flood, and these statements are found to be borne out in the main by the contents of the tablets. There is thus a twofold testimony as to the occurrence of a deluge in that Babylonian plain which the Old Testament history represents as the earliest seat of antediluvian man. As Lenormant has well shown, the tradition exists in the ancient literature of India, Persia, Phenicia, Phrygia, and Greece, and can be recognized in the traditions of Northern and Western Europe and of America, while the Egyptians had a similar account of the destruction of men, but apparently not by water. Thus we find this story widely spread over the earth, and possessed by members of all the leading divisions of mankind. This does not necessarily prove the universality of the deluge, though every distinct people naturally refers it to its own country. It shows, however, the existence of some very early common source of the tradition, and the variations are not more than were to have been expected in the different channels of transmission.

2. Parallel with this historical evidence lies the result of geological and archæological research, which has revealed to us the remains and works of prehistoric men, racially distinct from those of modern times, and who inhabited the earth at a period when its animal population was to a great extent different from that at present existing, and when its physical condition was also in many respects distinct. Thus in Europe and Asia, and to some extent also in America, we have evidence that the present races of men were preceded by others which have passed away, and this at the same time with many important species of land animals, once the contemporaries of man, but now known only as fossils. These ancient men are those called by geologists later pleistocene, or post-glacial, or the men of the cave and gravel deposits, or of the age of the mammoth, and who have been designated by archæologists palæolithic men, or more properly, palæocosmic men, since the character of their stone implements is only one not very important feature of their history, and implements of the palæolithic type have been used in all periods, and indeed are still used in some places.

3. The prevalence among geologists of an exaggerated and unreasonable uniformitarianism, which refused to allow sufficient prominence to sudden cataclysms arising from the slow accumulation of natural forces, and which was a natural reaction from the convulsive geology of an earlier period, has caused the idea to be generally entertained that the age of palæocosmic men was of vast duration, and passed only by slow gradations and a gradual transition into the new conditions of the modern period. This view long was, and still is, an obstacle to any rational correlation of the geological and traditional history of man. Recently, however, new views have been forced on geologists, and have led many of the most sagacious observers and reasoners to see that the palæocosmic period is much nearer to us than we had imagined. The arguments for this I have repeated in so many forms in

---

[*] See also Howorth: "The Mammoth and the Flood;" and papers by the Duke of Argyll in this Review, and by Prof. Prestwich in the "Journal" of the Geological Society, and by Andrews, Winchell, and others in America

previous publications that I need not reiterate them here. A few leading points may, however, be noted. One of these is the small amount of physical or organic change which has occurred since the close of the palæocosmic period. Another is the more rapid rate of erosion and deposition by rivers in the modern period than had previously been supposed. Another is the striking fact that a large number of mammals, like the mammoth and woolly rhinoceros, seem to have perished simultaneously with the palæocosmic men, and this by some sudden catastrophe.* It has also been shown by Pictet and Dawkins that all the extant mammals of Europe already existed in the post-glacial age, but along with many others now altogether or locally extinct. Thus there seems to have been the removal over the whole northern hemisphere of a number of the largest mammals, while a selected number survived and no additions were made. Again, while at one time it was supposed that the remains of palæocosmic man and his contemporaries were confined to caverns and river alluvia, it is now known that they occur also on high plateaus and water-sheds, in beds of gravel and silt which must have been deposited there under conditions of submergence and somewhat active current drift, perhaps in some cases aided by floating ice.† Lastly, while, as must naturally be the case, in some places the remains of ancient and more modern men are mixed, or seem to pass into each other; in others, as in the Belgian and Lebanon caves and in the superficial deposits, there is a distinct separation implying an interval accompanied by physical change between the time of the earlier and later men.

Such considerations as these, the force of which is most strongly felt by those best acquainted with the methods of investigation employed by geologists and archæologists, are forcing us to conclude: (1) That there are indicated in the latest geological formations two distinct human periods, an earlier and a later, characterized by differences of faunæ, and of physical conditions, as well as by distinct races of men. (2) That these two periods are separated by a somewhat rapid physical change of the nature of submergence, or by a series of changes locally sudden and generally not long continued. (3) That it is not improbable that this greatest of all revolutions in human affairs may be the same that has so impressed itself on the memory of the survivors as to form the basis of all the traditions and historical accounts of the deluge.

This being the state of the case, it becomes expedient to review our ideas of the ancient Hebrew records, from which our early, and perhaps crude, impressions of this event were derived, and to ascertain how much of our notions of the deluge of Genesis may be fairly deduced from the record itself, and how much may be due to more or less correct interpretations, or to our own fancy. In connection with this we may also be able to obtain some guidance as to the value to be attached to the Hebrew document as a veritable and primitive record of the great catastrophe.

The key to the understanding of the early human history of Genesis lies in the story of the fall of man, and its sequel in the murder of Abel by his brother Cain, the beginning of that reign of violence which endures even to this day. From this arose the first division of the human race into hostile clans or tribes, the races of Cain and Seth, on which hinges the history, characteristics and fate of antediluvian man, and, as we shall see in the sequel, from this arose profound differences in religious beliefs, which have tinged the theology and superstitions of all subsequent times. Of course, in making this statement I refer to the history given in Genesis, without special reference to its intrinsic truth or credibility, but merely in relation to its interpretation in harmony with its own statements.

It is further evident that this tragic event must have occurred in that Tigro-Euphratean region which was the site of Eden,* and that while the Sethite race presumably occupied the original home of Adam, and adhered to that form of religion which is expressed in the worship of Jahveh, the Coming Redeemer and the expected "Seed of the Woman," the other race spread itself more widely, probably attained to a higher civilization, in so far as art is concerned, in some of its divisions, and sank to a deeper barbarism in others, while it retained the original worship of God the Creator (Elohim). Hence the Sethite race is designated as the sons of Adam (Beni ha Adam), the true and legitimate children of the first man, and the Cainites as Beni Elohim, or sons of God.† The mixture of these races produced the godless, heaven-defying Nephelim, the Titans of the Old Testament, whose wickedness brought on the diluvial catastrophe. These half-breeds of the antediluvian time were in all probability the best developed, physically and perhaps mentally, of the men of their period ; and but for the deluge they might have become masters of the world.

---

* Howorth: "The Mammoth and the Flood."

† Prestwich on deposits at Ightham, Kent, "Journal Geological Society," May, 1889.

* "Modern Science in Bible Lands," chap. iv.

† That this is the true meaning of the expressions in Genesis vi. I cannot doubt. See discussion of the subject in the work cited in previous note.

This question of different races and religions before the flood is, however, deserving of a little farther elucidation. The names Elohim and Jahveh are used conjointly throughout the Book of Genesis except in its first chapter, and their mode of occurrence cannot be explained merely on the theory of two documents pieced together by an editor. It has a deeper significance than this, and one which indicates a radical diversity between Elohists and Jahvists even in this early period. In the earliest part of the human history, as distinguished from the general record of creation, the two names are united in the compound Jahveh-Elohim, but immediately after the fall Eve is represented as attributing to, or identifying with, Jahveh alone the birth of her eldest son—"I have produced a man the Jahveh," and which may mean that she supposed Cain to be the promised manifestation of God as the Redeemer. Accordingly Cain and Abel are represented as offering sacrifice to Jahveh, and yet it is said in a verse which must be a part of the same document, that it was not till the time of Enosh, a grandson of Adam, that men began to invoke the name of Jahveh. It would seem also that this invocation of Jahveh was peculiar to the Sethites, and that the Cainites were still worshippers of Elohim, the God of nature and creation. Hence their title of Beni ha Elohim. Thus the division between the Cainite and Sethite races early became accentuated by a sectarian distinction as well. We may imagine that the Cainites, worshipping God as creator, and ignoring that doctrine of a redeemer which seemed confined to the rival race of Seth, were the deists of their time, and held a position which might, according to culture and circumstances, degenerate into a polytheistic nature-worship, or harden into an absolute materialism. On the other hand, the Sethites, recognized by the author of Genesis as the orthodox descendants of Adam, and invoking Jehovah, held to the promise of a coming Saviour and to a deliverance from the effects of the fall to be achieved by his means.

It is clear that, from the point of view of the author of Genesis, the chosen seed of Seth should have maintained their separation from a wicked world. Their failure to do this involves them in the wrath of Jahveh and renders the destruction of mankind necessary, and in this the whole Godhead, under its combined aspects of Elohim and Jahveh, takes a part. A similar view has caused the Chaldean narrator to invoke the aid of all the gods in his pantheon to effect the destruction of man.

These considerations farther throw light on the double character of the deluge narrative in Genesis, which has induced those ingenious scholars who occupy themselves with analysis or disintegration of the Pentateuch, to affirm two narratives, one Elohist and one Jahvist.[*] Whatever value may attach to this hypothesis, it is evident that if the history is thus made up of two documents it gains in value, since this would imply that the editor had at his disposal two chronicles embodying the observations of two narrators, possibly of different sects, if these differences were perpetuated in the post-diluvian world ; and farther, that he is enabled to affirm that the catastrophe affected both the great races of men. It farther would imply that these early documents were used by the writer to produce his combined narrative almost without change of diction, so that they remain in their original form of the alleged testimony of eye-witnesses, a peculiarity which attaches also to the Chaldean version, as this purports to be in the form given by Hasisatra, the Chaldean Noah himself.[†]

Let us now inquire into the physical aspects of the deluge, as they are said to have presented themselves to the ancient witness or witnesses to whom we owe the biblical account of the catastrophe ; and let it be observed here that we are dealing not with prehistoric events but with a written history, supposed by some to have been compiled from two contemporary documents, and corroborated by the testimony of the ancient Chaldean tablets, copied by the scribes of Assurbanipal, apparently from different originals, preserved in very ancient Chaldean temples.

The preparation of an ark or ship, and the accommodation therein, not only of Noah and his family, but of a certain number of animals, is a feature in which most deluge narratives agree. This implies a considerable advance in the arts of construction and navigation, but not more than we have a right to infer from the perfection of these arts in early post-diluvian times, when it can scarcely be supposed that the new communities of men had fully regained the position of their ancestors before the destruction caused by the great flood. Lenormant, however, remarks here :

---

[*] See, for a very clear statement of these views, Prof. Green in "Hebraica," Jan., 1889, along with Dr. Harper's *resumé* of the Pentateuchal criticism in the previous number.

[†] Translation of G. Smith and others.

> "The biblical narrative bears the stamp of an inland nation, ignorant of things appertaining to navigation. In Genesis the name of the ark, Têbâh, signifies 'chest,' and not 'vessel;' and there is nothing said about launching the ark on the water; no mention either of the sea, or of navigation, or any pilot. In the Epopee of Uruk, on the other hand, everything indicates that it was composed among a maritime people; each circumstance reflects the manners and customs of the dwellers on the shores of the Persian Gulf. Hasisatra goes on board a vessel, distinctly alluded to by its appropriate appellation; this ship is launched and makes a trial-trip to test it: all its chinks are caulked with bitumen, and it is placed under the charge of a pilot."

This remark, which I find made by other commentators as well, suggests, it seems to me, somewhat different conclusions. The Hebrews when settled, either in Egypt or in Canaan, were near to the sea-coast, and familiar with boats and with the ships of the Phenicians. If, therefore, they persisted in calling Noah's ark a "chest," it must have been from unwillingness to change an old history derived from their Chaldean or Mesopotamian ancestors, or because they continued to regard the ark as rather a great box than a ship properly so called. On the other hand, it is likely that the particulars in the Chaldean account came from later manipulation of the narrative, after commerce and navigation on the Euphrates and Persian Gulf had become familiar to the Chaldeans. Thus in this as in other respects the Hebrew narrative is the more primitive of the two, and is consistent with the necessity of divine instructions to Noah, which, if he had been familiar with navigation, would not have been necessary.*

As in the Chaldean version, the biblical history begins with the specification of the ark. On this (Elohist) portion, it is only necessary to say that the dimensions of the ark are large and well adapted to stowage rather than to speed, and that within it was strengthened by three decks and by a number of bulkheads, or partitions, separating the rooms, or berths, into which it was divided. Without, it was protected and rendered tight by coats of resinous or asphaltic varnish (copher), and it was built of the lightest and most durable kind of wood (gopher or cypress). Only two openings are mentioned, a hatch or window above, and a port or door in the side. There is no mention of any masts, rigging, or other means of propulsion or steerage. The Chaldean history differs in introducing a steersman, thus implying the means of propulsion as in an actual ship.

Noah is instructed, in addition to his own family, to provide for animals, two of every kind; but these very general terms are afterwards limited by the words "uph, bemah, and remesh," which define birds, cattle, and small quadrupeds as those specially intended. Noah's ark was not a menagerie, but a cattle-ship, capable perhaps of accommodating as many animals as one of those steamers which now transfer to England the animal produce of Western fields and prairies. The animals portrayed on the ancient monuments of Egypt and Assyria, however, inform us that, in early post-diluvial times, and therefore probably also in the time of Noah, a greater variety of animals were under the control of man than is the case in any one country at present.* In the passage referring to the embarkation, only the cattle and fowls are mentioned, but seven pairs are to be taken of the clean species which could be used as food, "seven seven," as the old record has it.† The embarkation having been completed on the very day when the deluge commenced, we have next the narrative of the flood itself. Here it is noteworthy that God (Elohim) makes the arrangements, and Jahveh shuts the voyagers in.

The first note that our witness enters in his "log" relates to his impressions of the causes of the catastrophe, which was not effected supernaturally, but by natural causes. These are the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep" and the "opening of the windows of heaven." These expressions must be interpreted in accordance with the use of similar terms in the account of creation in Genesis i., the more so that this statement is a portion regarded by the composite theory as Elohistic. On this principle of interpretation, the great deep is that universal ocean which prevailed before the elevation of the dry land, and the breaking up of its fountains is the removal of that restriction placed upon it when its waters were gathered together into one place. In other words, the meaning is the invasion of the land by the ocean. In like manner, the waters discharged from the windows of heaven are those suspended in the cloudy reservoirs of the atmospheric expanse; equivalent, therefore, to the great rain extending for forty days, as stated in an explanatory clause. The Chaldean record adds the phenomena of thunder and tempest, but omits the great deep, an indication that it is an independent account and by a less informed or less intelligent narrator. It is worthy of note that our narrator has no idea of any river inundation in the case.

---

* See also the evidence of an inland position of the writers in the record of creation in Genesis i., as stated in my work cited in previous note.

* Houghton: "Natural History of the Ancients," and "Trans. Society of Biblical Archæology;" also representations of tame antelopes, &c., on Egyptian monuments.

† This has been considered a later addition; but the practice of all primitive peoples has sanctioned the distinction of clean and unclean beasts, which is merely defined in the Mosaic law, not instituted for the first time.

At this stage we are brought into the presence of the question: Is the deluge represented as a miraculous or a merely natural phenomenon? Yet, from a scientific point of view, this question has not the significance usually attributed to it. True miracles are not, and cannot be, contraventions or violations of God's natural laws. They are merely unusual operations of natural powers under their proper laws, but employed by the Almighty for effecting spiritual ends. Thus, naturally, they are under the laws of the material world, but, spiritually, they belong to a higher sphere. In the present case, according to the narrative in Genesis, the flood was physically as much a natural phenomenon as the earthquakes at Ischia, or the eruption of Krakatao. It was a miraculous or spiritual intervention only in so far as it was related to the destruction of an ungodly race, and as it was announced beforehand by a prophet. Had the approaching eruption of Krakatao been intended as a judgment on the wicked, and had it been revealed to any one who had taken pains to warn his countrymen and then to provide for his own safety, this would have given to that eruption as much of a miraculous character as the Bible attaches to the deluge. In the New Testament, where we have more definite information as to miracles, they are usually called "powers" and "signs," less prominence being given to the mere wonder which is implied in the term "miracle." Under the aspect of *powers* they imply that the Creator can do many things beyond our power and comprehension, just as in a lesser way a civilized man, from his greater knowledge of natural laws and command over natural energies, can do much that is incomprehensible to a savage; and in this direction science teaches us that, given an omnipotent God, the field of miracle is infinite. As *signs*, on the other hand, such displays of power connect themselves with the moral and spiritual world, and become teachers of higher truths and proofs of divine interference. The true position of miracles as signs is remarkably brought out in that argument of Christ, in which He says, "If ye believe not My words, believe Me for the works' sake." It is as if a civilized visitor to some barbarous land, who had been describing to an incredulous audience the wonders of his own country, were to exhibit to them a watch or a microscope, and then to appeal to them that these were things just as mysterious and incredible as those of which he had been speaking.

Returning to the deluge, we may observe that such an invasion of the great deep is paralleled by many of which geology presents to us the evidence, and that our knowledge of Nature enables us to conceive of the possibility of greater miracles of physical change than any on record, such as, for instance, the explosion of the earth itself into an infinity of particles, the final extinction of the solar heat, or the accession to this heat of such additional fierceness as to burn up the attendant planets. All this might take place without any interference with God's laws, but merely by correlations and adjustments of them, as much within His power as the turning on or stopping of a machine is in the power of a human engineer. Further, such acts of divine power may be related to moral and spiritual things just as easily as any outward action resulting from our own will may be determined by moral considerations. The time is past when any rational objection can be made on the part of science to the so-called miracles of the Bible.

To return to the passengers in the ark. This must have been built on high ground, or the progress of the deluge must have been slow, for forty days elapsed before the waters reached the ship and floated it. It is not unlikely that the Ark was built on rising ground, for here supplies of timber would be nearer. It has puzzled some simple antiquarians to find dug-out canoes of prehistoric date on the tops of hills; but they did not reflect that the maker of a canoe would construct his vessel where the suitable wood could be found, since it would be much easier to carry the finished canoe to the shore than to drag thither the solid log out of which it was to be fashioned. So Noah would naturally build his ark where the wood he required could be procured most easily. The Chaldean narrator seems to have overlooked this simple consideration, for he mentions a launching and trial trip of the ship, a sure mark that he is a later authority than the writer in Genesis.

The inmates of the ark now felt that it was moving on the waters, a new and dread sensation which must have deeply impressed their minds, and they soon became aware that the ark not merely floated, but "went," or made progress in some definite direction. Remark the simple yet significant notes—"The ark was lift up from the earth," and "the ark went upon the face of the waters." The direction of driftage is not stated, but it is a fair inference, from the probable place of departure in Chaldea and that of final grounding of the ark, that it was northward or inland, which would indicate that the chief supply of water was from the Indian Ocean, and that it was flowing inward toward the great sunken plain of interior Asia; which, however, the ark did not reach, but grounded in the hilly region known to the Hebrews as Ararat, to the Chaldeans as Nisr. A curious statement is made here (Elohist) as to the depth of the water being fifteen cubits. Even in a flat country so small a depth would not cover the rising grounds; but this is obviously not the meaning of the narrator, but something much more sensible and practical. It is not unlikely that the measure stated was the water-draught of the loaded ark, and that as the voyagers felt it rise and fall on the waves, they may have experienced some anxiety lest it should strike and go to pieces. It was no small part of the providential arrangement in their case that in the track of the ark everything was submerged more than fifteen cubits before they reached it. Hence this note, which is at the same time one of the criteria of the simple veracity of the history. The only other remark in this part of the narrative relates to the entire submergence of the whole country within sight, and the consequent destruction of animal life; and here the enumeration covers all land animals, and the terms used are thus more general than those applied to the animals preserved in the ark. The deluge culminated, in so far as our narrator observed, in one hundred and fifty days.

His next experience is of a gale of wind, accompanied or followed by cessation of the rain and of the inflow of the oceanic waters.* The waters then decreased, not regularly, but by an intermittent process, "going and returning;" but whether this was a tidal phenomenon or of the nature of earthquake waves we have no information. At length the ark grounded, apparently on high ground or in thick weather, for no land was visible; but at length, after two months, neighboring hill-tops were seen.

The incident of sending out birds to test the recession of the waters deserves notice, because of its apparently trivial nature, because it appears with variations in the Chaldean account, and because it has been treated in a remarkably unscientific manner by some critics. It indicates the uncertainty which would arise in the mind of the patriarch because of the fluctuating decrease of the waters, and possibly also a misty condition of the air preventing a distinct view of distant objects. The birds selected for the purpose were singularly appropriate. The raven is by habit a wanderer, and remarkable for power of flight and clearness of distant vision. So long therefore as it made the ark its headquarters, "going and returning"* from its search for food, it might be inferred that no habitable land was accessible. The dove, sent out immediately after the raven,† is of a different habit. It could not act as a scavenger of the waters and go and return, but could leave only if it found land covered with vegetation. As a domesticated bird also, it would naturally come back to be taken into the ark. Hence it was sent forth at intervals of seven days, returning with an olive leaf when it found tree-tops above the water, and remaining away when it found food and shelter. The Chaldean account adds a third bird, the swallow—a perfectly useless addition, since this bird, if taken into the ark at all, would from its habits of life be incapable of affording any information. This addition is a mark of interpolation in the Chaldean version, and proceeded perhaps from the sacred character attached by popular superstition to the swallow, or from the familiar habits of the bird suggesting to some later editor its appropriateness. Singularly enough, the usually judicious Schrader, probably from deficient knowledge of the habits of birds, fails to appreciate all this, and after a long discussion prefers the Babylonian legend for reasons of a most unscientific character, actually condemning the perfectly natural and clear biblical story as artificial and due to a recent emendation. He says: "When the story passed over to the Hebrews, the name of the swallow has disappeared," and "it is only from the Babylonian narrative that the selection of the different birds becomes clear." This little disquisition of Schrader is, indeed, one of the most amusing instances of that inversion of sound criticism which results when unscientific commentators tamper with the plain statements of truthful and observant witnesses.

The uncertainty indicated by the mission of the birds seems to have continued from the first day of the tenth to the first day of the first month, when Noah at length ventured to remove the covering of the ark and inspect the condition of the surrounding country, now abandoned by the waters but not thoroughly dried for some time longer. Still so timid was the patriarch that he did not dare without a special command to leave his place of safety. I am aware that if the two alleged documents are arbitrarily separated it is possible to see here some apparent contradiction in dates; but this is not necessary if we leave them in their original relation.*

---

* Genesis viii. 1, 2. "And Elohim made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters abated," &c.

* Margin of Authorised Version; less fully, "to and fro" in the text.

† There is no reason to suppose, as some have done, a hiatus here in the narrative.

It will be observed that a narrative such as that summarized above, bears unmistakably stamped upon it the characteristics of the testimony of an eye-witness. By whomsoever reduced to writing and finally edited, it must, if genuine, have come down nearly in its present form from the time of the catastrophe which it relates. It follows that the narrator leaves no place for the current questions as to the universality of the deluge. It was universal so far as his experience extended, but that is all. He is not responsible for what occurred beyond the limits of his observation, and beyond the fact that man, so far as known to him, perished. If, therefore, as some have held,† Balaam in his prophecy refers to Cainite populations as extant in his time, or if Moses declines to trace to any of the post-diluvian patriarchs the Rephaim, Emim, Zuzim and other prehistoric peoples of Palestine, we may infer, without any contradiction of our narrative, that there were surviving antediluvians other than the Noachidæ, whatever improbability may attach to this on other grounds, and more especially from the now ascertained extension of the post-glacial submergence over nearly all parts of the northern hemisphere.

Let it also be noticed that beyond the prophetic intimation to Noah, and the one expression, Jahveh "shut him in," which may refer merely to providential care, there is, as already remarked, nothing miraculous, in the popular sense of that term; and that mythical elements, such as those introduced into the Babylonian narrative, are altogether absent. The story relates to plain matters of fact, which if they happened at all any one might observe, and for the proof of which any ordinary testimony would be sufficient. It may be profitable, however, to revert here to the probable relation of this narrative to the geological facts already adverted to, and also its bearing on the mythical and polytheistic additions which we find in the deluge stories of heathen nations.

Regarding the biblical deluge as a record of a submergence of a vast region of Eurasia and Northern Africa at least, while no similar catastrophe has been recorded subsequently, it is unquestionable that submergences equally important have occurred again and again in the geological history of our continents, and have been equally destructive of animal life. It is true that most of these are believed to have been of more slow and gradual character than that recorded in Genesis, but in the case of many of them this is a very uncertain inference from the analogy of modern changes; and it is certain that the post-glacial submergence, which closed the era of palæocosmic man and his companion animals, must have been one of the most transient on record. On the other hand, we need not limit the entire duration of the Noachic submergence to the single year whose record has been preserved to us. Local subsidence may have been in progress throughout the later antediluvian age, and the experience of the narrator in Genesis may have related only to its culmination in the central district of human residence.

It is needless, then, to enter into further details, though these are sufficient to fill volumes if desired, in proof of the remarkable convergence of history and geological discovery on the great flood, which now constitutes one of the most remarkable illustrations of the points of contact of science proceeding on its own methods of investigation and divine revelation, preserving the records of ancient events otherwise lost or buried under accretions of myth and fancy. I have elsewhere endeavoured to show * that the earliest races of palæocosmic men, the Canstadt and Cro-magnon races, very fairly correspond with what may have been the characteristics of the ruder tribes of Cainites, and that the antediluvian civilization indicated by the narrative of the deluge could scarcely be expected to have left many accessible remains, though it is implied in the fact that the post-diluvian nations present themselves to us at once with a somewhat advanced condition of the arts, especially in Chaldea and in Egypt.

There are many other points relating to the deluge which invite more detailed discussion, as, for instance, its absolute date, its precise geographical limitations, and its relation to archæology and to theories of development. These I have discussed elsewhere, and have not space to refer to them here. It may, however, be proper to suggest to speculative archæologists that they cannot safely assume that all antediluvian or palæolithic tribes were barbarous or semi-brutal, or that there was a continuous development of humanity without any diluvial catastrophe. It is also somewhat rash to carry back the chronology of Egyptians and Babylonians to times when, as we know on physical evidence, the Valley of the Nile was an arm of the sea, and the plain of the Euphrates an extension of the Persian Gulf. It is fortunate for the Bible that such assumptions do not occur in its teaching.

---

* See Green, "Hebraica," *l. c.*

† Motais, "Deluge Biblique."

* "Modern Science in Bible Lands."

It is well, however, to consider shortly the fact that the new light we are obtaining respecting antediluvian man and the deluge will enable us better to understand the origin and significance of myths of heathen antiquity based on the traditions of these early events. One intention of the early chapters of Genesis was evidently to inculcate that historical view of idolatry which traces the gods of the heathen to early heroes and patriarchs. Hea, Hasisatra, Merodach, Ishtar, and a host of other mythical personages of the Assyrian pantheon are now resolving themselves into purely human beings, who figure as men and women in the Pentateuch. No illustration of this is more patent than that of Ishtar, the Astarte of the Syrians, the Artemis of the Greeks, and who has been identified with the chief female divinity of many other ancient nations, even with that Diana whom "all Asia and the inhabited world worshippeth."

The Chaldean deluge tablets for the first time introduce her to us as an antediluvian goddess, and inform us that she is the deified mother of men, the same with the biblical Isha or Eve. In the crisis of the deluge we are told, "Ishtar spoke like a little child, the great goddess pronounced her discourse, Behold how mankind has returned to clay. I am the mother who brought forth men, and like the fishes they fill the sea. The gods, because of the angels of the abyss, are weeping with me." Ishtar is thus the mother goddess, mourning the destruction of her children, though herself gone into the heavens. In Chaldea, as in the Bible, she is the mother of the promised seed, and, according to the tradition, her worship began in Eden, or Idinu, in southern Babylonia.* But what is her connection with Tammuz, the Adonis of the Greeks, so called from the Semitic title Adonai, my lord, applied to him. Ishtar has been represented as the bride of Tammuz; but it now appears that in the oldest Babylonian legend she is his mother,† that he was a shepherd dwelling in Eden, and murdered by his brother, Adar, who is also a god, more especially a god of war; and mourned for by his mother, whose celebrated descent into Hades is a myth based on this relation. In short, the story of Ishtar, Tammuz, and Adar, the fertile parent of so varied and widespread mythology, is merely a version of the story of Cain and Abel, and hence the belief that the murder of Tammuz was the cause of the deluge. Hence, also, the commemoration of the death of Tammuz by the annual lamentation of the women—"weeping for Tammuz," * and this rite was probably antediluvian, and a superstition of the Sethites rather than of the Cainites.

Oppert regards the legend of Tammuz and Ishtar as a solar myth, and supposes that the story of Cain and Abel was based on it. But a family history of crime and sorrow is a much more real and probable thing as a basis for tradition than a solar myth, and naturalists at least will be disposed to invert the theory and to believe that the simple Bible story was the foundation of all the varied cults and superstitions that clustered round Ishtar and Tammuz, as well as personages like Osiris and Isis, who seem to have been later avatars or revivals of the same tale.

It would be easy to show that the deluge story has intimate connections with other ancient myths and superstitions, as well as with the results of modern archæology and geology. But were this all, our inquiry, however interesting and curious, would have little practical value. It has two important bearings on the present time. Christianity founds itself, its founder himself being witness, on the early chapters of Genesis, as history and prophecy, and the treatment which these ancient and inspired records have met with in modern times at the hands of destructive criticism is doing its worst in aid of the anti-Christian tendencies of our time. To remove the doubts that have been cast on these old records is therefore a clear gain to the highest interests of humanity, and if theology and philology are unable to secure this benefit, natural science may well step forward to lend its aid. Another connection with present interests depends on the fact that, while superstitions akin to that which deified the mother of the promised seed, and introduced the world-wide cults of Astarte and Aphrodite, still reign over great masses of men, absolute materialism and desperate struggle for existence among men and nations are growing and extending themselves as never before since the antediluvian times, and are provoking a like signal and direful vengeance. In the midst of all this, Christians look forward to the second coming of Jesus Christ to destroy the powers of evil and to inaugurate a better time; and it was He who said—"As it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be in the days of the Son of Man." Let us remember the old story of the flood of Noah lest that day come on us unawares.

---

* Sayce, Hibbert Lectures.

† *Ibid.*

* Ezekiel viii. 14.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SEE OF BALTIMORE.

BY WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY, BISHOP OF IOWA.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Nov. 16, 1889.

THERE has been celebrated, both in the old world and in the new, the centenary of the consecration in the "upper room" at Aberdeen by the College of Scottish Bishops on November 14th, 1784, of Samuel Seabury, D.D., *Oxon.*, to the Episcopate of Connecticut. With like honor as with equal cause, the centenary of consecration at Lambeth chapel, February 4, 1787, by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough, of William White as Bishop of Pennsylvania and Samuel Provoost as Bishop of New York,—the first Bishops for America in the English line,—has been celebrated on both sides of the Atlantic. The Churches of the Anglican communion throughout the world took note in their observance of this centennial anniversary of the completion of the canonical number of bishops for the transmission of the episcopal office to all time to come in the Church of the United States. Shortly, Virginia will celebrate the centenary of the consecration at Lambeth of James Madison, the first Bishop of that See. A little later, Maryland will observe the centenary of the consecration of Thomas John Claggett, D.D., the first bishop consecrated on American soil and uniting in himself the succession of the Scottish and the English lines.

The Romish hierarchy, though a little lagging in these centennial observances, is about to commemorate, not the consecration of its first bishop which took place on the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1790, but the establishment by papal bull of the See of Baltimore over which the amiable and excellent Carroll was to be made bishop agreeably to the request of the Romish priests in America. It is possible that there may be a display of the usual astuteness of the Roman authorities in this choice of the date of commemoration. In marked contrast with the pains taken in the cases of Seabury, White and Provoost, and, in fact, in all subsequent American consecrations, that three bishops, at least, as prescribed in the ancient canons, should take part in the conferring of the episcopal office, the first incumbent of the new See of Baltimore was consecrated by a single bishop and one, too, *in partibus*,—a titular bishop of Rama, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Walmsley, the senior Vicar Apostolic of the Roman Catholics of England, assisted only by two priests. This consecration by a single bishop was contemplated in the papal bull as will be seen below. It was done in a private chapel belonging to the estate of a Romanist gentleman, and although "the richness of the vestments" of the Bishop of Rama and the newly-made Bishop of Baltimore, "the music of the choir," the "multitude of wax-lights" and "the ornaments of the altar," seem to have impressed the narrator of this event, these accessories of the function will scarcely make up for the obscurity and irregularity of this act which gave to the Romanists of the United States the first prelate of their communion and the one through whom alone until a comparatively recent date all their consecrations are derived.

The register of Lambeth—that which contains the entry of Archbishop Parker's consecration—contains the record duly certified and attested of the consecration of White and Provoost, and at a later date that of Madison. The "Concordate" and the letter of consecration of Seabury, duly signed and sealed by the Scottish College, are still to be seen in confirmation of the event they record. It is so with the papers attesting the due and canonical admission to his sacred office of the first Catholic Bishop of Maryland, Dr. Claggett. Of the irregular establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States, the rare tract, we reprint, is a proof, and we submit that in comparison with the abundant evidence afforded in the cases of the canonical conferring both in Scotland and England of the Episcopal office for the United States of the true Catholic succession, the consecration of which this tractate is proof, is wanting both in dignity, in authority and in accordance with Catholic and primitive usage. To those who regard the fiat of the pontiff as overriding the ancient canons, it may be satisfactory. The true Catholic must pronounce this act done in the chapel of Ludlow Castle on the Feast of the Assumption, 1790, both irregular, uncanonical, and wanting in that publicity which is an important part of such a function.

The Roman Catholic succession in the United States thus depending on a single thread, was, we believe, never strengthened until the arrival of the Papal Nuncio, Bedini, who in the struggles preceding the unification of Italy had won an unenviable reputation. Known as the "Butcher of Bologna" this prelate was deemed by many as having vitiated his Episcopal character by the ruthless massacre which he ordered or at least condoned. We submit that these circumstances combined make more of a "Nag's Head consecration" among our Roman Catholic brethren than can in justice, or historically, be laid at our door.

The history of the pamphlet from which we reprint the authority of his holiness Pope Pius VI. for constituting the new See of Baltimore in Maryland, is, in itself, interesting.* Procured in London by the late Historiographer of the Church, the Rev. Francis Lister Hawks, D.D., LL.D., while in search of material for the elucidation of the history of the American Church, this copy, believed by Dr. Hawks to be almost if not wholly unique, was presented by him to the writer with the injunction to keep it with care as a paper of great interest and importance. Reproduced a number of years ago by the photolithographic process for the members of "The Historical Club," one of the few copies of this fac-simile fell into the hands of some Roman Catholic by whom it was pronounced to be "a Protestant forgery." The original was thereupon submitted to no less an authority than the distinguished Roman Catholic historian, John Gilmary Shea, LL.D., who, on examination, acknowledged the authenticity of the pamphlet, the existence of which, however, he had not previously known. It is given *verbatim et literatim.*

THE AUTHORITY OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS VI. FOR CONSTITUTING THE NEW SEE OF BALTIMORE IN MARYLAND. TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL. FOR THE REMEMBRANCE OF POSTERITY.

When from the eminence of our apostolical station, we bend our attention to the different regions of the earth, in order to fulfil to the utmost extent of our power the duty which our Lord has imposed upon our unworthiness of ruling and feeding his flock; our care and solicitude are particularly engaged, that the faithful of Christ who dispersed through various provinces are united with us by Catholic communion, may be governed by their proper pastors and diligently instructed by them in the discipline of evangelical life and doctrine. For it is our principle, that they who relying on the divine assistance have regulated their lives and manners, agreeably to the precepts of Christian wisdom, ought so to command their own passions as to promote by the pursuit of justice their own and their neighbor's spiritual advantage; and that they, who have received from their bishops, and by checking the intemperance of self-wisdom, have steadily adhered to the heavenly doctrine delivered by Christ to the Catholic Church, should not be carried away by every wind of doctrine, but grounded on the authority of divine revelation should reject the new and varying doctrines of men, which endanger the tranquillity of government, and rest in the unchangeable faith of the Catholic Church. For in the present degeneracy of corrupt manners into which human nature ever resisting the sweet yoke of Christ is hurried, and in the pride of talents and knowledge which disdains to submit the opinions and dreams of men to the evangelical truth delivered by Jesus Christ, support must be given by that heavenly authority which is entrusted to the Catholic Church as to a steady pillar and solid foundation which shall never fail, that from her voice and instructions mankind may learn the objects of their faith and the rules of their conduct, not only for the obtaining of eternal salvation, but also for the regulation of this life and the maintaining of concord in the society of this earthly city. Now this charge of teaching and ruling first given to the apostles and especially to St. Peter the prince of the apostles, on whom alone the Church is built, and to whom our Lord and Redeemer entrusted the feeding of his lambs and of his sheep, has been derived in due order of succession to bishops, and especially to the Roman Pontiffs, successors of St. Peter and heirs of his power and dignity, that thereby it might be made evident that the gates of hell can never prevail against the Church, and that the divine founder of it will ever assist it to the consummation of ages, so that neither in the depravity of morals nor in the fluctuation of novel opinions the episcopal succession shall ever fail or the bark of Peter be sunk. Wherefore it having reached our ears that in the flourishing commonwealth of the Thirteen American States many faithful Christians united in communion with the chair of Peter, in which the centre of Catholic unity is fixed, and governed in their spiritual concerns by their own priests having care of souls, earnestly desire that a bishop may be appointed over them to exercise the functions of Episcopal order, to feed them more largely with the food of salutary doctrine, and to guard more carefully that portion of the Catholic flock; we willingly embraced this opportunity which the grace of Almighty God has afforded us to provide those distant regions with the comfort and ministry of a Catholic Bishop. And that this be effected more successfully and according to the rules of the sacred canons, we commissioned our venerable brethren the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, directors of the Congregation *de propaganda fide,* to manage this business with the greatest care and to make a report to us. It was therefore appointed by their decree, approved by us, and published the twelfth day of July of the last year, that the priests who lawfully exercise the sacred ministry and have care of souls in the United States of America, should be empowered to advise together and to determine, first, in what town the Episcopal See ought to be erected, and next who of the aforesaid priests appeared the most worthy and proper to be promoted to the important charge, whom we, for this first time only, and by special grace permitted the said priests to elect and to present to this apostolical See. In obedience to this decree the aforesaid priests exercising the cure of souls in the United States of America, unanimously agreed, that a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction ought to be established in the town of Baltimore, because this town situate in Maryland, which province the greater part of the priests and of the faithful inhabit, appeared the most conveniently placed for intercourse with the other States, and because from this province Catholic religion and faith had been propagated into the others. And at the time appointed for the election, they being assembled together, the sacrifice of holy Mass being celebrated, and the grace and assistance of the Holy Ghost being implored, the votes of all present were taken, and of twenty-six priests who were assembled twenty-four gave their votes for our beloved son John Carroll, whom they judged the most proper to support the burden of episcopacy, and sent an authentic instrument of the whole transaction to the aforesaid Congregation of Cardinals. Now all things being maturely weighed and considered in this congregation, it was easily agreed that the interests and increase of Catholic religion would be greatly promoted, if an Episcopal See were erected at Baltimore, and the said John Carroll were appointed the bishop of it. We therefore, to whom this opinion has been reported by our beloved son Cardinal Antonelli, Prefect of the said congregation, having nothing more at heart than to ensure success to whatever tends to the propagation of true religion and to the honor and increase of the Catholic Church; by the plenitude of our apostolical power, and by the tenor of these present, do establish and erect the aforesaid town of Baltimore into an Episcopal See forever, for one bishop to be chosen by us in all future vacancies; and we therefore, by the apostolical authority aforesaid, do allow, grant and permit to the bishop of the said city, and to his successors in all future times, to exercise Episcopal power and jurisdiction, and to hold and enjoy all and every right and privilege of order and jurisdiction, and of every other Episcopal function, and which bishops constituted in other places are empowered to hold and enjoy in their respective churches, cities and dioceses, by right, custom or by other means, by general privileges, graces, indults and apostolical dispensations, together with all pre-eminencies, honors, immunities, graces and favors, which other cathedral churches, by right or custom, or in any other sort, have, hold and enjoy. We moreover decree and declare the said Episcopal See thus erected, to be subject or suffragan to no metropolitan right or jurisdiction, but to be forever subject immediately to us, and to our successors the Roman Pontiffs, and to this apostolical See. And till another opportunity shall be presented to us of establishing other Catholic Bishops in the United States of America, and till other dispositions shall be made by this apostolical See, we declare, by our apostolical authority, all the faithful of Christ living in Catholic communion, as well ecclesiastics as seculars, and all the clergy and people dwelling in the aforesaid United States of America, though hitherto they may have been subject to other bishops of other dioceses, to be henceforward subject to the Bishop of Baltimore in all future times; and to this bishop and to his successors we impart power to curb and check, without appeal, all persons who may contradict or oppose their orders, to visit personally or by deputies all Catholic churches, to remove abuses, to correct the manners of the faithful, and to perform all things which other bishops in their respective dioceses are accustomed to do and perform, saving in all things our own authority and that of this apostolical See. And, whereas by special grant, and for this first time only, we have allowed the priests exercising the cure of souls in the United States of America, to elect a person to be appointed bishop by us, and almost all their votes have been given to our beloved son John Carroll, Priest; we being otherwise certified of his faith, prudence, piety and zeal, foreasmuch as by our mandate he hath during the late years directed the spiritual government of souls, do therefore, by the plenitude of our authority, declare, create, appoint and constitute the said John Carroll Bishop and Pàstor of the said Church of Baltimore, granting to him the faculty of receiving the rite of consecration from any Catholic Bishop holding communion with the apostolical See, assisted by two ecclesiastics vested with some dignity, in case that two bishops cannot be had, first having taken the usual oath according to the Roman Pontifical. And we commission the said bishop-elect to erect a church in the said city of Baltimore, in form of a cathedral church, inasmuch as the times and circumstances may allow, to institute a body of clergy deputed to divine worship and to the service of the said church, and moreover to establish an Episcopal seminary either in the same city or elsewhere as he shall judge most expedient, to administer ecclesiastical incomes, and to execute all other things which he shall think in the Lord to be expedient for the increase of Catholic faith and the augmentation of the worship and splendor of the new-erected church. We moreover enjoin the said bishop to obey the injunctions of our venerable brethren the Cardinals, Directors of the sacred Congregation *de propaganda fide*, to transmit to them at proper times a relation of his visitation of his church, and to inform them of all things which he shall judge to be useful to the spiritual good and salvation of the flock trusted to his charge. We therefore decree that these our letters are and ever shall be firm, valid and efficacious, and shall obtain their full and entire effect, and be observed inviolable by all persons whom it now doth or hereafter may concern; and that all judges, ordinary and delegated, even auditors of causes of the sacred apostolical palace, and Cardinals of the holy Roman Church must thus judge and define, depriving all and each of them of all power and authority to judge or interpret in any other manner, and declaring all to be null and void, if any one, by any authority, should presume, either knowingly or unknowingly, to attempt any thing contrary thereunto. Notwithstanding all apostolical, general or special constitutions and ordinations, published in universal, provincial and synodical councils, and all things contrary whatsoever.

---

* The title-page bears a wood-cut reproduction of the seal of the new See of Baltimore. In the outer circle are the words *Ne derelinquas nos Domine Deus Noster*, surmounted by a cardinal's hat, and above the crossed keys are the words, in a circle, *Joannes Epis. Baltimorensis*, MDCCXC. Within the circle formed by these words are the thirteen stars grouped around a representation of the Blessed Virgin crowned, holding in one hand a sceptre terminated by a cross, and in the other the Holy Child with the aureole.

Given at Rome at St. Mary Major, under the Fisherman's Ring (*Seal*) *the* 6*th day of November* 1789, *and in the* 15*th Year of our Pontificate.*

DUPLICATE.

[L.S.]

R. CARD. BRASCHI ONESTI.

THE COLLEGE OF CARDINALS.

From the New York *Freeman's Journal* (Roman Catholic), Dec. 26, 1889.

EDITOR STEAD, of the London *Pall Mall Gazette*, is now in Rome, writing up the institutions there. His letters are very interesting, and doubtless he means well; but unfortunately he lacks that intimate knowledge of Catholicity, which is the conspicuous failing of many of the most cultivated and best disposed Protestant writers on such subjects. The topic of his last letter is the College of Cardinals, and he grieves over the fact that it is composed of thirty-two Italian and only twenty-eight non-Italian members. He says:

"It is not impossible that the Holy See, with its great position and splendid traditions of human service, may become the centre of organized human effort for the amelioration of the lot of men, not by virtue of any arbitrary authority, human or divine, but because it may make itself the heart and the brain of collective humanity. . . . No one would, of course, propose to demand the rigorous application of a system of proportional representation to the College of Cardinals. But the general principle that the interests of unrepresented people are apt to be overlooked holds so far good in affairs ecclesiastical as well as in affairs political that it may be worth while roughly to jot down side by side the number of red hats allotted to the different nations and the number that would be accorded to them if distribution went according to population. I take the figures from the 'Annales des Missions Catholiques' and the official 'Gerarchi:'"

Country.	*Catholics.*	*Cardinals.*	*Due Proportion.*
France	36,400,000	7	10
Austria-Hungary	29,580,000	4	8
Italy	28,000,000	32	8
Spain	16,870,000	4	4
Germany	16,230,000	3	4
Belgium	5,500,000	..	2
Poland	4,500,000	1	1
Portugal	4,300,000	2	1
Ireland	3,960,000	..	1
Great Britain	1,320,000	3	..
Other Countries	6,000,000	..	2
America	51,000,000	2	15
Asia	9,000,000	..	3
Africa	2,600,000	1	1
Australia	670,000	1	
		60	60

At the end of his communication Mr. Stead draws some conclusions, and we trust he will forgive us if we say they are of an amusing character to a Catholic mind: "But I have said enough to show how utterly impossible it is for even the Catholic nations to regard the Curia as in any sense an adequate representation of their interests. If ever the Pope is to be commander-in-chief of the humanitarian forces of the world, he will have to recruit his headquarter's staff more evenly from all the nations under his control." We should remark, to begin with, that Mr. Stead fails to grasp the fact that the Catholic Church's government is not formed on the idea of representation, but on that of merit; she is not local, but universal, and has the whole world to choose from; her ministers are not called, but sent. The principle of representation is admitted as a subordinate one, and, all other things being equal, it undoubtedly decides the choice. No Bishop in America, we know for certain, has ever been chosen without the most searching and anxious inquiry. But still the principle which rules is that of sending, not calling. It is the principle established by Christ.

The College of Cardinals, as a body, performs only one function—that of electing the Pope. But this is an event of such rare occurrence that Mr. Stead does not refer to it. His complaint is especially of the Curia—the congregations or courts of Rome; and he totally misapprehends their functions. They are executive and judicial organizations, and have no legislative powers. The law-makers of the Church are the Bishops of the whole world in Ecumenical Council assembled, or else the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*. Moreover, the Pope would hardly undertake to promulgate a dogma without calling a universal assemblage, unless the pronouncement was imperatively called for by the Catholic world at a time when the assembling of the Council was impossible. In any event the Pope would act rather as judge than promulgator. Protestant controversialists have long reproached Rome with originating nothing new. That is so. The chief function of the Church's government is to preserve. It is the *depositum* of the Apostolic faith, which has remained essentially unchanged from the beginning. But deductions could be made from them, and can still, and over these the vast army of theologians frequently argued for hundreds of years before the Church decided. Perhaps the most striking instances are the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Pope's Infallibility, which were disputed points until the latter half of the present century, though they were contained embryonically in the original creed. For a full exposition of this subject we would refer Mr. Stead to Cardinal Newman's "Development of Christian Doctrine."

The reason why there is a preponderance of Italian Cardinals in the Congregations of the Vatican is purely practical. Of the Italian Cardinals, too, perhaps the majority are drawn from Rome and its immediate vicinity. The Sacred College originated in Rome, and at first its members consisted only of the Roman pastors. If Mr. Stead will look into the "Catholic Dictionary" he will see how gradually the scope of collegiate membership extended, and he surely knows that even yet every Cardinal is the pastor of a Roman Church, which he is obliged to support, without which he could not be a Cardinal at all.

The members of the Congregations are chosen from among the Cardinals by the Pope just as the President of the United States chooses the members of his Cabinet. The Pope selects those he thinks most capable of directing the different Executive and Judicial Departments of the Papal Government. Two considerations incline his choice: First, they must be the most thoroughly posted in canon law, moral theology, dogma, and the doctrinal disputes of the past and present; secondly, they must live in Rome. Roman Prelates are, naturally, the best informed on the subjects mentioned, and therefore they predominate in the Roman Courts. Eminent Protestants like Guizot, Leibnitz, Neander, and others, who devoted, not a mere transient attention, but a deep study, to the history of Christianity, have acknowledged the impartial fairness of these tribunals and the vast services rendered to civilization by the Papacy.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CENTENNIAL.

From *The Central Christian Advocate* (Methodist), St. Louis, Nov. 20, 1889.

ONE hundred years ago, or, to be exact, on Nov. 6, 1789, the Roman Catholic hierarchy was established in the United States by the appointment of John Carroll as bishop of Baltimore. At that time the Catholic population of the country was estimated at about 30,000. The Romish Church has in the United States to-day, according to Archbishop Ryan, 9,000,000 adherents, 8,000 priests, 10,000 churches and chapels, 27 seminaries and 650 colleges and academies, and over 3,000 parish schools. These figures are not remarkable when we consider what proportion of the emigration to America during the last twenty-five years has been Roman Catholic. The 9,000,000 Romanists —if we admit that there are that many in this country—represent but a very small per cent. of actual converts. The Catholic Church in the United States has largely grown at the expense of Romanism in Europe. But it is all the stronger on this account, for the loyalty of the European accessions is not affected by any fondness for American institutions. The close of its first century in this country finds the Church of Rome firmly established in the cities and large towns, more aggressive in its movements, and growing in political power. The centennial of its establishment in the United States was celebrated on Sunday, Nov. 10, with imposing services in the cathedral at Baltimore. It was a great demonstration, in full keeping with the importance of the event. Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, made the address in the morning, and Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, in the evening. The address of the former was much more liberal and patriotic than the usual public speeches of Roman ecclesiastics, and parts of it read as if they were prepared especially with the view of making an impression upon the non-Catholic population of the country.

But the most significant feature of the centennial celebration was the Congress of Catholic Laymen, held in Baltimore Nov. 11 and 12. This Congress, the first of the kind that ever assembled in the United States, is a new departure that the Protestant public will regard with especial interest. It seems to have been quite successful, and arrangements were made to hold in 1892 an international congress of like character in the city where the World's Fair is located. The Congress discussed such subjects as lay action in the Church, the rights of the State in education, the independence of the Holy See, capital and labor, Sunday observance, etc., and issued a platform of principles, or rather a line of practice in regard to public questions, which is quite out of the usual line. What is intended as the most assuring confession is made in regard to their devotion to republican institutions, and that the truest patriotism is not incompatible with perfect loyalty to the Church of which they are members. It favors Christian education, by which, however, it means the inculcation of Roman Catholicism with secular education, and makes the old plea that the public school system is godless, and therefore the parochial school system is to be developed. Some recognition is taken of the disposition among the members of the Church to form class societies, yet they are urged to adopt the St. Vincent De Paul Society as the typical Roman Catholic Church organization, which is rather of a benevolent character. Among the recommendations are congregational singing, and the co-operation of the laymen with the clergy in the discussion of all questions which relate to the social life of the community. The most striking part of the paper is that relating to co-operation with non-Roman Catholic citizens to procure proper Sunday observance, the suppression of intemperance, and the destruction of the influence of the saloon in politics. Of course the Roman Catholic idea of Sabbath observance and temperance is not that of Protestantism. But it does, after all, show that the laymen are in advance of the priests in some of these matters. The paper in several parts runs counter to the ordinary sense and principles of Romanism. It is an evidence, however, that the laymen are constituting themselves an advanced column. Their association with Protestants has in some measure produced a spirit of liberalism in opposition to the doctrine of their Church. But we are not to look for a revolution in the thinking or practice of Romanism. The spirit and utterances of the Papacy have always been against the principles of free speech and a free press. It has been always and is to-day a spiritual despotism so far as it can exert its power.

The centennial celebration concluded with the dedication on Nov. 13 of the Catholic University at Washington. Bishop Gillmour, of Cleveland, preached the sermon on this occasion. The banquet which followed the formal dedication was attended by the President and vice-President of the United States and the members of the Cabinet.

THE MORMON QUESTION.

From *The Living Church* (Episcopalian), Chicago, Dec. 21, 1889.

It is an encouraging sign of the times that public sentiment has been aroused to see that Mormonism is a menace to our institutions. As long as it was supposed that it was merely a question of religion, the spirit of religious liberty which permits every one in this land to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, operated to grant freedom to the followers of Brigham Young. Thus it has happened that polygamy has been winked at and murder condoned, and the community at Salt Lake suffered to grow by immigration, and flourish by means of their industry.

But of late years, the country has been waking up to the fact that the Mormon Church is not only immoral, but also disloyal, that its spirit is inimical to American institutions, and that its continued existence means a continual defiance of the laws of the United States. Senator Edmunds' bill has had good effect in this, that it has been the cause of exposing the animus of Mormon institutions. As the provisions of that bill have been put in execution, it has had the effect of revealing facts which go to show that nothing short of extermination of Mormonism as an institution will reach and cure that hideous plague spot in our land.

A recent decision of the United States court in Utah confirms our opinion. Application for citizenship had been made by certain Mormons. The applications were denied by the court on the ground that "the evidence establishes beyond any reasonable doubt that the endowment ceremonies are inconsistent with the oath an applicant for citizenship is required to take, and that the oaths, obligations, or covenants there made or entered into are incompatible with the obligations and duties of citizens of the United States."

It is evident, however, that denial of citizenship will not remove the evil. The cause remains imbedded in the constitution of the Mormon Church. It is a case which calls for radical treatment.

A correspondent of the Chicago *Tribune* has given a most practical and sensible suggestion. That paper, at the conclusion of an excellent article on the subject, asked: "What, then, is the remedy that will extirpate the evil, which has lasted, and strengthened, and spread for half a century?" We quote our writer's reply, at some length:

"Having some knowledge of Mormon matters, I answer that one of the remedies is, stopping the source of supply at Castle Garden, New York.

"Most of the Mormon recruits are drawn from the lower classes of English, Welsh, and Scandinavian people.

"They have been able to get a few proselytes from the ignorant white population of Georgia and North Carolina, but the great bulk of Mormon emigrants come through Castle Garden, New York, and if that emigration can be stopped, the Mormon leaders will be at a loss for recruits. The duty of Congress is therefore to close this avenue of supply, as it is believed can be done.

"The money to get these Mormon emigrants to our shores and thence to Utah is provided by the Mormon Church, which, it is generally understood, keeps a large deposit in London. The Mormon property confiscated under the Edmunds law by the Government represented, is, I believe, less than $500,000. It has been estimated that for the last twenty years the tithes collected by the Mormon Church from their people in Utah, Nevada, and Idaho, have not been less than $1,000,000 annually. This money is used for bringing fresh supplies of Mormons to Utah, and no doubt a large portion goes to enrich the few Mormon leaders.

"Now, if the 'sinews of war' can be attacked or made useless for the purpose for which it is employed, another remedy will be found effective in extirpating the 'evil.'

"Still another remedy suggested is the disfranchisement of every Mormon who has practised polygamy and been convicted under the Edmunds law, or who is not willing to take the oath of allegiance to the United States, and absolve himself from his allegiance to the Mormon Church. When an alien takes out his naturalization papers he is required by the Constitution to absolve his allegiance to all foreign powers, especially that one he hailed from and belonged to.

"Every Mormon gives his allegiance to the Mormon Church first, last, and all the time, and this Mormon Church has been and is to-day a great political power, having for one of its characteristic features disloyalty to our Government. . . . The duty of Congress is now to strike down this hydra-headed monster, which will bring trouble and possibly bloodshed in the future if longer dallied with as it has been."

When public opinion speaks in this emphatic manner, there is some hope that the time is not far distant when drastic remedies will be applied, and this reproach upon our civilization be removed. Congress is now in session, and if our readers would write to their Congressmen, calling attention to existing facts, and urging legislation, much good might be accomplished.

PLAGIARISM.

BY J. B. GRAVES.

From *The Christian-Evangelist* (Disciple), St. Louis, Nov. 28, 1889.

It is our duty and pleasure as students to gather knowledge from every available source—from the word and works of God, and from the sayings and doings of men ; and this knowledge we must make known to men for their profit and improvement. For the purpose of increasing knowledge, we have established colleges and curriculums, rostrums and pulpits, and publish books and papers by the million. All these are legitimate sources of information. Through all these agencies we try to fill the minds of men with knowledge, and then we say to them, "Go, preach."

If they go, and from the fund of wisdom they have been amassing, frame their own sermons, speeches or writings, using independence and originality in construction, diction and expression, they do well, and about all they can do. Originality in the absolute is impossible, and were it possible, it would measurably be undesirable ; for it would render useless all our study and observation. It is only relative ; we cannot invent any new simple ideas, not one ; but we can bring into existence new combinations of thought. By comparison, reflection and induction, we can reach novel conclusions, different from all others ; or possibly the same conclusions, but by a different mental route. By such mental processes, too, we can give birth to new expressions and combinations of thought, or put old truths in a new dress. Some housewives cannot cut a child's garment unless they have a pattern or seen the shape. They can follow the pattern made by someone else, but cannot give shape to a new garment. They have a genius for imitation, but none for creation.

So it is with preachers. Some have the faculty of following in the lead of other men, using their outlines and their ideas, giving expression to their thoughts with very little variation of form, thus stultifying their own powers of creation by voluntarily accepting materials ready-made. While they have a faculty for following, for taking and imitating, they have no faculty for breaking away from the deep-worn ruts and blazing out a road of their own, for making and teaching. The ideal housewife is one who has genius and spirit enough to originate a few new things, one who is capable sometimes of introducing something surprising, of making something hitherto unknown, one who can produce something original, one who is not content to be continually following the pattern of somebody else. The ideal preacher is not an echo, but a voice. Breaking away from the lines and outlines of other men, he marks out a course of his own. His subject is his own, yet it may be the same as, or the modification of, another's. His method of treatment is his own, yet the material of the treatment may be drawn from others. It is perfectly legitimate for us to draw argument from, or find corroboration in, another. But in getting this material, we should be careful of two things :

(1) To give proper credit for the material if we use it without alteration. If a whole sermon is so used, it should be so accredited to its real author. Any considerable extract should be treated in the same way. If, however, we give the drift of a man's thought, if we contract, expand, or otherwise modify it, we are under no obligation so to accredit it ; for in its alteration we have asserted our individuality, and the transformed or deformed production is not his, but ours. But even in such mutilation we should be careful to stamp ourselves so indelibly upon the matter of thought, so that our hearers cannot say, "That's Spurgeon." And if such multilations of another's sermon, to get one of our own, is practised to save the work of preparing a new and fresh one, it is as bad as stealing it outright, for laziness is as sinful in a preacher as literary theft.

(2) We should be careful, second, to make the material ours. We can so master a thought, so thoroughly understand it, as to make it a part of us, and when it is perfectly mastered and moulded into our possession, so that we can express it in a variety of shapes, we can express it as our own, and need not refer to the real author of it, or the one from whom we derived it. The same may be said of a theory, or a whole system of philosophy. I will illustrate what I mean. "The earth is round like a ball." That is a fact of geography. I learned it of Monteith. But I have so mastered the truth that it is mine ; and when I use it, I am under no obligation to state the source of my information. "The square root of 25 is 5." I learned that from Ray. But that truth is so mastered and fixed in me, that it is no more Ray's than it is mine. And when I state that or any other mathematical fact,

I am not under necessity of quoting my author. Truth is eternal; these authors do not originate them, they only discover them. By hard study I may thoroughly understand the Nebular Hypothesis which accounts for the development and organization of the heavens and the earth. And when the items of the philosophy are well understood, we do not need to say, "Thus saith La Place." We can state the theory or the facts independently, as though they were our own. And so of all other knowledge.

But if in imparting knowledge I should attempt to make the impression that I discovered a certain truth, or framed a certain philosophy, or composed a certain fine passage, or prepared a certain striking sermon, when in fact I borrowed it from another, I am guilty of plagiarism. To use another's ideas is not plagiarism, but to use another's ideas as your own, is. Webster defines a plagiarist to be "one who purloins another's writings, and offers them to the public as his own." To commit a sermon and deliver it as an original one is plagiarism. To take a sermon outline prepared by another and use it "in toto," text, division, subdivision, argument, conclusion and application, is another example of the same thing. But if you get an idea here, an argument there, an illustration yonder, and bring these together in a new relation, in a new arrangement, the sermon is a new one, though every idea may be old and borrowed. That is not plagiarism. Yet, in bringing this foreign material into our sermons, we must guard against a too free use, and an exactness of quotation. It is better for us and our hearers, too, to give the thought of another in our own language. I would lay down this rule for us as preachers: Keep away from skeletons and outlines; depend upon genius for creation of forms and expressions, and put as much individuality into the sermon as possible. It is better to preach a poor sermon of our own than a good one of Talmage's.

THE PRE-HISTORIC BOOK CONCERN.

From *Zion's Herald* (Methodist), Boston, Dec. 4, 1889.

In studying the Book Concern, whose centennial we celebrate, we need to use the new historic method which traces existing institutions back into earlier ages. Back of the historic Book Concern was a primitive institution on horseback, out of which the current establishment grew. If the itinerant, with his saddle-bags stored with vital literature, had not gone before, the princely House on Fifth Avenue would not have followed. In germ, the Book Concern was in those inevitable saddle-bags. To spread our books was an indispensable part of the preacher's task; for, in carrying out his mission of evangelism, he used the press as well as the living voice. The idea originated with Wesley, and was imported into America by the preachers he early sent over. They came with a book as well as a spoken Gospel.

On the frontier they were the pioneers in the business, preceding not only the shopkeeper, but the enemy who uses the press to scatter in the virgin soil the seeds of evil. This early use of the press was of unspeakable service to the cause of Christ. It tended to neutralize the errors which inevitably spring up in new countries. In the controversies then rife with deism, Calvinism, and other forms of error, the book served a good purpose. Besides the thunderbolts he could hurl from the pulpit, a book or tract might be left behind as a torpedo to explode under the feet of the errorist.

In this way the early preacher did much to shape the reading of his own flock and the community. By circulating instructive, vital books, he kept those which were deleterious or less valuable out of the way, and preoccupied the minds of the readers with better things.

The books of the early preachers were mostly printed in England. The societies here, until 1785, were under Wesley, who felt the same concern to give them good reading as a good Gospel. Robert Williams began to reprint some of Wesley's works; but the Conference forbade him to do so without the authority of the founder and the consent of the Conference. They respected Wesley's copyright and were jealous of works which could not meet the approval of the brotherhood.

With the early itinerants, book-selling, so far from being a mercenary business, was an important evangelistic method. The money was of little importance compared with the soul-saving, for which they exhibited an eager desire. The two ends they ever held in view are admirably set forth in the address, made to the people by the Philadelphia Conference in 1799, written by Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, the book steward. "It is well understood," is the language of the address, "that the book business among us is designed for the excellent purpose of spreading and cultivating moral and religious knowledge; hence we confine ourselves to the publication of books and pamphlets upon the subjects of morality and divinity, more especially such as treat on experimental and practical religion. It is also known that the pecuniary profits arising from the business are appropriated to the exclusive benefit of the connection, as an auxiliary to us in spreading the Gospel of our salvation the more extensively through the world."

In 1789 the book business had grown so that it seemed good to the Conference to appoint John Dickins "general book steward," or manager of the book business in the church. In doing this, the Conference had no idea of building a mammoth publishing house. The Book Concern was the invention of the newly-chosen steward. His business brain suggested the importance of a headquarters for the business; and in securing this, he was building larger than he knew. He planned for a small store-room; the small store-room was the germ of the greatest religious book-making establishment on the globe.

THE BINGHAM MEMORIAL.

From *The Advance* (Congregational), Chicago, Dec. 19, 1889.

THE man who preached the first Christian sermon in Honolulu, of the Sandwich Islands, was Rev. Hiram Bingham. That was April 25, 1820. Mr. Bingham, a native of Vermont, was born October 30, just one hundred years ago. The one hundredth birthday of this honored apostle to the Hawaiian Islands was most appropriately commemorated in the Kawaiahao Church, Honolulu, of which we find an exceedingly interesting account in the *Hawaiian Gazette*, as also in *The Friend*, published in that city. Pictures were shown of the two grass buildings first used as churches. The first, erected in 1821, was destroyed by fire in 1829; the second, erected in 1829, was 196 feet long by 68 feet wide, and would accommodate 4,000 persons. This also was a thatched building. The present church is built of stone. Rev. H. H. Parker gave the historical address, exhibiting, among other things, the original constitution of the church, as organized in 1826, with the autograph signatures of the Kaahuawana, Kalaimoka and John Li. The venerable Dr. Lowell Smith told of the wonderful work of God in the great revival of 1837 to 1840, when he was associated with Pastor Bingham. A sermon in the Hawaiian was preached by Rev. J. K. Iosepa, of Hana, followed by addresses in English by Rev. Hiram Bingham, and by Gen. Marshall, who came to the islands in 1830, who spoke of his association for some twenty years with Gen. S. C. Armstrong, a son of Mr. Bingham's successor as pastor of this church, and whose work at Hampton for negroes and Indians Whittier speaks of as "the noblest work now being done in the country;" and another address by Joshua Kua. The following is a portion of it:

"One hundred years ago to-day was born the man who laid the foundations of this house. Fifty years ago he, with his faithful workers, laid the corner-stone. He and his colleagues brought to our people the greatest gift that heaven has bestowed upon mankind, a Christian faith and a Christian civilization. Hiram Bingham and his colleagues have passed from human vision; the places that once knew them, know them no more. But the work they began here will never cease. That work takes hold on the things that are lasting. They preached not themselves, but Jesus Christ the Lord of all. They came not to set up a material kingdom. They came to plant the seed of a spiritual kingdom that should give life to us all. They looked not at the things which are seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal. The seed which they planted will grow on continuously because it takes hold on the things that are unseen and eternal.

"Of the three pioneers in the great work which was begun here in 1820, Mr. Whitney went to his rest at Lahainaluna, Mr. Thurston was laid away in the beautiful Nuuanu Valley, while Mr. Bingham died far away from here in his native land. Had he been permitted to choose where he should close this mortal life, doubtless he would have said, 'Let me lie down among the loved people with whom I have labored.'

"It is fitting, therefore, that we should place here, by the side of the corner-stone of the church which he with his people laid more than fifty years ago, this tablet in memory of Hiram Bingham. Let us never forget the first message that he delivered to the people of this land: 'Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be for all people.'

"Let us also ever cherish the memory of these good Aliis and their people, whose name has come down to us from a former generation, like a sweet savor.

"Underneath that corner-stone is a copper plate upon which is the first engraving ever done by a Hawaiian. The work was done by Kapeau, and this is the inscription he made. 'This is a house for Jehovah the God of Heaven, the Father; the Son and the Holy Spirit; a house of prayer erected by the first church and congregation of

Honolulu, a place for them to worship the true God. Those people who have been very helpful in this work are Kamehameha III., Kaahumanu II., Auhea, Liliha, Kehauonohi, Kehuanaoa, Governor of Oahu, Paki, and Koohokalole.'

"My friends, great changes have taken place within the last fifty years; but the work that Mr. Bingham and his co-laborers began here has gone right along through all these changes. And the next fifty years will see still greater progress."

At the conclusion of Mr. Kua's address, the white marble Tablet attached to the front of the church (the marble from Rutland, Vt.), was unveiled by Hiram Bingham, 3d, a lad of thirteen. The following is the inscription which it bears:

A CENTENNIAL MEMORIAL OF

HIRAM BINGHAM.

Born in Bennington, Vt., October 30th, 1789.

Died in New Haven, Ct., November 11th, 1869,

aged 80 years.

This slab is placed here in grateful remembrance of a pioneer missionary by descendants of Hawaiians (aided by his children among whom he preached Christ for more than twenty years. He preached the first sermon ever delivered in this city April 25th, 1820, from "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy." Here he taught confiding kings, queens, and chiefs, faced dangers, and bore calumny from abroad; aided in reducing the language to writing, translated much of the Bible, composed books, hymns and tunes; here he baptized a thousand converts, planted a church, planned this edifice, and with his loving people, on June 8th, 1839, laid this adjoining corner-stone, beneath which was placed a Hawaiian Bible, first published May 10th, 1839. From here, amid loud wailings of hundreds of his flock, he sailed on August 3d, 1840, to revisit his native land; but never returning, was not with them, when, on July 12th, 1842, with joyful acclamation, they thus dedicated this church,

"To Jehovah our God forever and ever."

THE MISSION [OF THE UNIVERSALISTS] TO JAPAN.—THE LEADER SELECTED.

From *The Universalist*, Chicago, Dec. 14, 1889.

THE General Secretary, Rev. Dr. Demarest, writes as follows under date of Nov. 30, conveying an important and pleasing announcement:

"I have the pleasure to announce to the subscribers to the fund for the Mission to Japan and to all well-wishers of the enterprise, that the Committee on Foreign Missions, with the approval of such of the Trustees of the General Convention as could be consulted, have entered into preliminary arrangements with Rev. Geo. L. Perin, of Boston, as the leader of the mission. He expects to enter upon the mission in the early spring and to continue in the service for at least five years. It is believed that the appointment will give great satisfaction to the friends of the mission; and a large increase of subscriptions is expected."

The above announcement was ready for our columns last week, but was withheld. It is now authorized by all parties in interest. It will be greeted with sincere pleasure throughout our Church. It gives assurance that the long-contemplated mission to Japan is approaching its consummation, and under circumstances which will inspire a fair degree of confidence in the success of the enterprise. Rev. Mr. Perin, who is thus constituted the leader in this mission, is one of our young clergymen who has achieved substantial success in the two important positions which he has occupied in the pastorate —Bryan, O., and Boston. He is now the pastor of the Shawmut Avenue church, in the latter city, where he has been eminently successful in the five years of his ministry. Owing to changes in the population, and other embarrassments of the situation, it was an exacting and unpromising field when he took charge; but by dint of well-directed perseverance, large industry, good pulpit ability and excellent pastoral gifts, he has revived the church, and placed it in a condition of substantial prosperity. It will require a large degree of sacrifice for this people to give up their earnest young pastor for work in the distant foreign field. But the parish will doubtless rise to the occasion, and while regretting the combination of circumstances which calls Mr. Perin away, will regard it as an honor to their church that their pastor is to become the first Universalist missionary to Japan.

The selection of Mr. Perin as the leader in this initial missionary enterprise of our Church will be regarded as a master-stroke for the success of the mission. It is one of the very best of half-a-dozen selections that could have been made. It has ability, youth, activity, and supreme devotion to our Church on its side. It will furnish the best of evidence to our people that the mission is planned on a broad scale and proposes to succeed. It will doubtless result in contributing a large measure of confidence to the movement among the great body of our people which will result in the speedy filling up of the subscription to the needful amount. The only regret is that it will take from our church work at home a valuable and much-needed worker. But "the field is the world," and whether at home or abroad, in Christian or pagan land, the gospel needs its workers, and we should rejoice when they go forth to their appointed fields. May the Lord grant his blessing to this new movement in our Church, and bestow all needful wisdom and strength to him who has now accepted its duties and responsibilities.

INDIA'S CRITICAL PERIOD.

BY B. H. BADLEY, D.D.

From *The Central Christian Advocate* (Methodist), St. Louis, Nov. 13, 1889.

Of all times this is the time when the Church should be at work in India—and hard at work. It is a critical time. "The old order changeth, giving place to the new." The new India springing up is very different from the old; it must be permeated with the ennobling spirit of Christianity.

There is much unrest in India. The great deeps are being stirred as never before. The determination to blindly follow ancestral examples is weakening; the Hindu begins to feel that whether he will it or not he must change; he is awaking to the thought that the world is moving, and the thought brings discomfiture: he turns to his priests for help, but they too are changing and are helpless. English education and the railway are largely responsible for this unrest. Government schools, mission schools and private institutions are found throughout the empire. A growing desire to know English fills these schools with students. Each student as he returns to his village home on holidays is a kind of missionary or tract distributor; he carries news regarding the great outside world, and the result is amazing. He gives up his old faith; the rude stone idol in the village temple receives no more floral offerings at his hands; his example is noted and often copied—and the village priest can do nothing.

The railway is a great iconoclast. Worshipped at first by the simple-minded Hindus, the iron horse goes thundering up and down the Ganges Valley, across the plains of Rajputana, down the Western Mountains to Bombay, across the Madras Presidency and so on to the farthest south. The railway, as has frequently been said, breaks down caste. At the outset the wily Brahmans, foreseeing the mischief that was sure to come, petitioned the Government to supply special carriages for Brahman passengers, but the request was refused. The alternative was to have nothing to do with the railway; but the Brahmans were not pious enough for such self-denial, and so they have taken their places in the waiting-rooms and in the cars side by side with low caste and outcasts; who can measure the results? The railway, too, makes pilgrimages vastly easier than in the olden times. *Then* it was a fortnight's occupation going from Lucknow to Benares on pilgrimage; *now*, for a small sum of money, "the mail" carries the pilgrim to the sacred city in less than twelve hours. It will hardly be maintained that the "railway pilgrim" is as devout as the other.

There is political unrest and agitation in India. A National Congress is held every year. This brings together delegates of all classes and religions—natives—from all parts of the empire. Congress meetings are held in all the large cities; eloquent speeches are made. The agitators, composed of so many diverse elements, are slow in advocating social reforms, but loud in demanding larger representation in the Government Councils of India, and also in Parliament. What the outcome will be none can tell. India is not yet ready for self-government.

There is a constant religious agitation. The *Brahmo Samaj* movement, which, under Keshub Chandra Sen, gave promise a dozen years ago of introducing a religious revival throughout India, is now doing next to nothing. It seems to have died when its founder died; in Lucknow the Brahmo Church stands almost neglected. In Calcutta Sen's followers are divided into two hostile camps, and there seems no hope for reconciliation.

The *Arya Samaj* is intensely active. This movement originated with Pandit Dayanand Saraswati, who died a few years ago. It is a desperate effort to call back the Hindus to the old paths, to the old Vedas; desperate because of the tricks and devices resorted to. The leaders, taking their cue from the missionaries, for whom naturally they have no love, have introduced schools and orphanages, and are working diligently to get possession of orphans. They have set up printing presses, and are publishing newspapers in the vernacular and in English.

They are sending out books and tracts full of misrepresentations of Christianity, and, besides, they have set to work a number of preachers who, like the missionaries, repair to the street corners and to the great religious fairs to preach their peculiar doctrines. In some places these zealous, misguided people have greatly damaged our missionary work. They have enticed away enquirers who were about to be baptized; they have seized new converts and hired them to give up Christianity. In many places they have overshot the mark. Recently in Allahabad their newspaper published a scandalous account of the conversion of a Hindu to Christianity, making an attack upon Rev. Mr. Lucas, of the American Presbyterian Church. The falsehoods were so numerous and glaring that the Arya editor was obliged to recall his statements in the next issue. The Arya preachers have everything to help them: the sympathy of their co-religionists, the national feeling of reverence for the ancestral faith, and many other influences. Their desire to overcome the influence of the missionaries, especially by street-preaching, has caused them to study the Bible very carefully and diligently. The result no doubt will be that some Arya Saul will become a helpful Paul.

As another illustration of the activity of the Hindus in new lines, reference may be made to the "Hindu Tract Society" at Madras. This is doing its best to tear down the work of the missionaries; naturally it turns to England and America and reprints the coarse attacks of infidel writers upon Christianity. The Society will probably have a brief existence. Hindus do not enjoy paying for such things; it "goes against the grain."

The Mohammedans are not asleep. They are not given to change. Their creed remains the same and their policy is unchanged. Their hands are tied in India, and doubtless they see but little daylight ahead. In some quarters they are becoming stirred up to greater zeal. Recently a large meeting was held in Lucknow, and it was decided that every Mohammedan was to urge upon every other Mohammedan the necessity of being present in the mosque for Friday prayers. The attendance has increased.

This agitation is not to be wondered at, it is a thing to be expected. Anything is better than stagnation. It is for such a time as this the Church exists. Its mission is to lay hold of and elevate men and women. It wins its greatest victories in the face of difficulties and upheavals. It is comforting to know that the Church in India is wide awake. It takes in the situation, and is planning accordingly. The splendid opportunity is not trifled with. Every possible agency is being laid hold of and used for Christ. It is seed-sowing time; it is also harvest time.

Our Methodist Church is doing its full share in at least most ways. We are in sad need of re-enforcements. In the midst of these exciting days and events, with these vast possibilities before us, it is sad to think that we have fewer Methodist missionaries in India to-day than we had a year ago. The ranks are not being kept full. What is to be done? We do not underestimate the worth of our native preachers; they are noble workers. *We* must decrease; *they* shall surely increase. But in the face of the influences that surround us, and the difficulty of the work upon us, we are constrained to call for volunteers, for re-enforcement from home. Who will come? We need good thinkers, logical writers, eloquent preachers, consecrated men of God. None can come too well prepared.

As an illustration of what is being done by our Church the *Central* readers will be glad to know that Bishop Thoburn is writing a sermonette each week, and these are being published at our Methodist "Book Concerns" in English, Bengali, Urdu and Hindu, in all 50,000 copies each week; and these are being carefully distributed in the zenana, the Mission school, the railway station, the shop and street. Great good is sure to follow.

SELF-COMPLACENT IGNORANCE.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, Nov. 28, 1889.

"No, I am not a member of any church," we recently heard a man say, "and I don't profess to be a Christian, but I am a better Christian than most church-members, for my religion is that of the Sermon on the Mount." Having no personal acquaintance with the speaker and no knowledge of his life, we could not question the truthfulness of the assertion, albeit the wise man's saying came to our mind and almost to our lips, "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth." It would be interesting to know if this man's friends and neighbors think that he lives up to his religion and exemplifies the Sermon on the Mount in his life better than most church-members embody their professed belief in their lives.

With every wish to be charitable, one cannot help drawing the conclusion that a man who speaks thus is densely ignorant, both of his own heart and of the Sermon on the Mount. Most of us can be very self-complacent so long as we look only on the good side of our own characters and contemplate only our good deeds. We can admire the Sermon on the Mount so long as we look only at its surface and think only of the beautiful and comforting things in it. We can be complacent because we do not try ourselves by any lofty moral standard, we can admire because we do not or will not comprehend the sweep of Christ's moral teaching. But complacency vanishes when we have a vision of perfect holiness; admiration gives place to terror when we feel the force of Christ's moral law.

For the Sermon on the Mount, so far from being a very easy law to live by, marks the utmost requirements of a holy law. The Ten Commandments were far exceeded by this new morality. The old law forbade murder; the new law teaches that to hate one's brother is as guilty in God's sight as the spilling of the blood. The old law was satisfied to prohibit the evil act; the new law is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. What man can say that he keeps the law of God thus interpreted? No sermon ever preached will so develop the sense of sin in an honest man as the Sermon on the Mount if it is read with an understanding mind. The self-complacent will be pricked in their hearts, and the law will prove to them a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ, if they honestly study this Scripture.

Perhaps there is no truth that is less enforced in these days, or that stands more in need of re-enforcement, than the holiness of God. For in the holiness of God we have the ground for the perfection of the moral law and the spiritual nature of its requirements. So long as moral law was looked upon as a mere code of rules for living, an arbitrary series of prohibitions—a law, in short, that depended for its authority on the sovereign pleasure of One who was omnipotent—its sanctions were mainly those of fear. But now we have reached the truer conception, that moral law is the expression of God's inmost nature, and merely requires of us likeness to him, the main sanction is that of love. But the first step to turn men from self to God is to give them a glimpse of God's holiness by the side of their own sinfulness, a knowledge of what his law really requires and of what they are by nature able to give. If this does not turn men to a Saviour who is able to save them from their sins and to sanctify them fully by his grace, they are past saving. It will at least destroy their complacency. If they choose evil for their good, they will make the choice deliberately and intelligently, with no delusion that evil is good, but knowing it for what it is and preferring it.

TIME SPENT IN PRAYER.

From *The St. Louis Christian Advocate* (Methodist), Dec. 18, 1889.

The Bible does not tell us how long we are to pray. Neither does it give direction as to the number of prayers we are to offer daily. Nor how much time each prayer should consume. All this is left to the spiritual demands of each day, and to the variable demands of spiritual need. While the commandment does not say, thus often and thus long, yet time is an essential factor in prayer. While many private prayers, in the nature of things, must be short; while all public prayers ought to be short; while there is ample room for and value put on ejaculatory prayer, yet in our private communions with God time is a feature essential to its value. Much time spent with God is the secret of all successful praying. Prayer which is felt as a mighty force is the mediate or immediate product of much time spent with God. Our short prayers owe their point and efficiency to the long ones that have preceded them. The minute prayer of prevalence cannot be prayed by one who has not prevailed with God in a mightier struggle of long continuance. Jacob's victory of faith could not have been gained without that all night wrestling. God's acquaintance is not made by pop calls. God does not bestow his gifts on the casual or hasty comers and goers. Much with God alone is the secret of knowing him and of influence with him. He yields to the persistency of a faith that knows him. He bestows his richest gifts upon those who declare their desire for and appreciation of those gifts by the constancy as well as earnestness of their importunity. Christ, who in this as well as other things is our example, spent many whole nights in prayer. His custom was to pray much; he had his habitual place to pray. Many long seasons of praying make up his history and character. Paul prayed day and night. It took time from very important interests for Daniel to pray three times a day. David's morning, noon and night praying were doubtless on many occasions very protracted. While we have no specific account of the time these Bible saints spent in prayer, yet the indications are that they consumed much time in prayer, and on some occasions long seasons of praying was their custom.

We would not have any one think that the value of their prayers is to be measured by the clock, but our purpose is to impress on our minds the necessity of being much alone with God, and that if this feature has not been produced by our faith then our faith is of a feeble and surface type.

The men who have most fully illustrated Christ in their character, and have most powerfully affected the world for him have been men who spent so much time with God as to make it a notable feature of their lives. Charles Simeon devoted the hours from 4 till 8 in the morning to God. Mr. Wesley spent two hours daily in prayer. Samuel Rutherford was up at 3 in the morning to give himself to prayer. Archbishop Leighton was so much alone with God that he seemed to be in a perpetual meditation. John Fletcher often spent whole nights in prayer. Bishop Ken was so much with God that his soul was said to be God-enamored. David Brainerd prayed hour after hour daily. Joseph Alleine spent from 4 till 8 in the morning with God. Luther spent his three best hours in prayer. John Welch prayed seven or eight hours a day. Robert McCheyne gave an hour after tea and from six to eight in the morning to God. There was no tendency in these men to count their prayers, or measure them by the watch. Neither did their being so much alone with God detract from their working energies; they were eminently men of practical as well as personal holiness; they were great workers as well as great prayers; these must go together in the Christian life.

The monks, in the interest of praying, divorced praying and working. We, in the interests of an impatient and almost frivolous working, have done the same thing. God has joined them together; let us not put them asunder. Mighty prayers make mighty workers. The secret of might in work lies in mighty praying.

BROTHER SMILER.

BY CLIFTON M. NICHOLS, SPRINGFIELD, O.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Dec. 5, 1889.

Brother Smiler's original and real name was Jones. He was at first a smiler, in a weak and wicked way, at the corner grocery, and his "smiles" cost him about two hundred dollars a year. It also cost him his self-respect, his good clothes, his peace of mind, his social standing, and everything like real happiness. It also took away his health, and at last, when prostrated on his bed, and humiliated, discouraged and hopeless, the pastor of the Pondale church came to see him. His wife told him that the minister had called for him, and he said to her, "Is it possible that that good man has come to see *me?*" It was. The good man went to his bedside, gave him a warm, cordial greeting, and attempted to administer to him the consolations of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and with a wonderful degree of success. For a new light shone into the soul of Jones. A new purpose was begotten in his heart. A new and kindly illumination blazed from his eye.

When Jones got about again, he was a new man. He was washed and clean shaved, his clothes were neatly brushed, and his shoes well polished. He at once joined the church, and he was so bright and hearty and cordial—he shook hands so vigorously, he entered into every kind of Christian and church work with such a will, and his face was continually on such a broad grin—that it was easy to see how Brother Jones very soon became known and mentioned everywhere as Brother Smiler. He was soon stationed at the front door of the church, and he greeted the incomers with such fervor, and blazed upon them with such genuine warmth, that they went to their pews with a real glow, and proved good ground for the seed the pastor sowed.

The smiles of Brother Smiler proved a power in the community. One day he met an inebriate and smiled on him. This was something the man of drams was not accustomed to, and it touched him. Brother Smiler said to him: "I used to be as you are, and I was miserable. I spent two hundred dollars each year at the saloon. Now I am a Christian, I put two hundred dollars each year in the church treasury, and I am happy." The testimony was taken as evidence. The inebriate was soon washed, and combed, and in his right mind. And so Brother Smiler went on smiling and shaking hands, in the name of the Lord, and there was much less smiling of the wrong, hurtful sort, and much more smiling of the right sort, in all that region round about.

This may be an improbable story, but it is true.

MORTGAGING CHURCH PROPERTY.

From *The Living Church* (Episcopalian), Chicago, Dec. 14, 1889.

Some time ago it was stated in *The Living Church* that one of the Brooklyn churches was proposing to put a mortgage on its property amounting to $50,000, when the Bishop would not permit the sum to exceed $35,000 and then only under certain conditions. This action of the Bishop led *The Brooklyn Eagle* to consult the books in the registrar's office and bring to light the mortgages resting on all the churches in Brooklyn, and Kings County in which Brooklyn is included. The showing is a remarkable one, and though not wholly correct, *The Eagle* reaffirms that it is substantially so, while it is plainly impartial. It is certain at least that the churches in all the denominations have largely put to sea in the same boat, whatever their chances and their fortunes in doing so.

According to *The Eagle's* figures, 303 of the 371 churches in Brooklyn and Kings County are "equipped" with mortgages, amounting to the neat little sum of $3,339,253, the order of the equipment being in the larger denominations as follows: Congregational churches, $157,987; Lutheran, $161,213; Reformed, $235,600; Baptist, $384,630; Presbyterian, $399,500; Protestant Episcopal, $411,400; Methodist, $415,632; Roman Catholic, $1,173,291. It will thus be seen that the Roman Catholic Church has so far distanced its competitors that if they wish to get even with it they must borrow in sums ranging from $25,000 to $50,000 each. Indeed, according to *The Eagle's* statement, the average mortgage now resting on each of 43 Roman Catholic Churches in the city and county, is $27,472, while including the entire number, 64, it is $18,333. On these mortgages *The Eagle* says the churches are paying $50,000 a year in interest, while first and last they have paid $1,000,000, or sufficient to build five first-class churches.

It is very certain, again, that Bishop Littlejohn and Bishop Loughlin have a very different way of looking at the matter of mortgaging Church property. According to the canon, it is the right of the former to veto a mortgage so far as it seems to him excessive, and it is on this ground that his right has been exercised, though but rarely. On the other hand, Bishop Loughlin seems to have known no law in mortgaging Church property, and to have exercised his rights without let or hindrance. In other words, beginning as far back as 1854, there are 39 mortgages standing in the Bishop's name, while in case of half-a-dozen churches the mortgages run from $35,000 to $110,000. That is certainly piling it on. No wonder that the Bishop has got the inside track, and that several institutions charged him only four and a half per cent., while in the same year, as *The Eagle* states, they have charged good Protestants six and seven per cent. Plainly, the only thing to do is for the latter to borrow more freely and mortgage more heavily, if they want to be accommodated. And when the Bishop has borrowed half a million, or in exact numbers, $449,500, from a single savings bank, let the others make it a half million better and so bring down the rates to four per cent. and possibly three and a half.

As showing how a church may abandon itself when it gets in the mortgaging way, *The Eagle* states that a single Methodist church has placed eleven mortgages on its property, a single Baptist Church fifteen, and a single Reformed church twenty-two! This gives an idea to work on. If the Protestant churches of Brooklyn and Kings County do not wish to encumber their property in single, solid amounts, ranging from $35,000 to $110,000, let them divide up such frightful sums into mortgaged amounts which shall make them seem harmless, not to say inviting. According to *The Eagle*, the mortgaged debts of twenty churches, all Protestant except five, amount to $1,000,000. Now how easy for twenty other churches to place upon their property from eleven to twenty-two mortgages, each, and to borrow another million in ways so much less objectionable when brought to the inspection of the public. It would take only forty churches to raise two millions in this way, while the rates very possibly need not be more than three per cent.

But jesting aside, *The Eagle's* showing has made evident two things: First, that the churches of all denominations have felt constrained to be heavy borrowers and to encumber a large percentage of all their property. Whether the financiering has been good or bad, it has been true of all, and when the churches have largely had the advantage of business men, it would be hasty to conclude that their financiering was bad, as a rule. The truth is, in a city of such phenomenal growth as Brooklyn, it was considered better to have mortgaged churches than not to have them at all. This was evidently Bishop Loughlin's view of the matter, who seems to have largely mortgaged some churches in order to build others, together with Church institutions. Moreover, there is some justice in the reasoning that those who in other years are to have the advantage of the churches, should, if need be, share in the burdens of building them.

On the other hand, it is plain to see that a general mortgaging has been gone into, which now, as ever, is sorely crippling scores of churches, as it is sure to do for years to come, if indeed many of them do not break down under their indebtedness. A glance at the list shows that very many churches have done nothing toward clearing off their mortgages, and that many others have added one mortgage to another, and are still struggling with their triple or quadruple burdens. All may yet go well if the tide of population sets in favorably and the preachers are popular, but what if matters take shape in the other direction ? How many contingencies which make the paying of a church debt well-nigh hopeless and impossible !

Altogether, Bishop Littlejohn has doubtless done wisely in setting down his foot. No one knows so well as a bishop how the financial question drags with most churches, even when it does not drag them down. What shifts and turns to get through the year ! What is worse, how often the financial burden weighs on the hearts of priest and people, to the grievous hindering of their work ! How much more than often the burden takes the shape of a mortgage and a mill-stone hanging round their neck from which there is no hope of deliverance ! Such being the case, is it not a bishop's duty to say to the churches under him, "Keep out of debt, if possible ; if debt is necessary, make it as light as possible, and get rid of it as soon as possible" ?

PASTORAL VISITING.

BY REV. JUDSON TITSWORTH, MILWAUKEE.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Dec. 19, 1889.

MUST it go ? There are many who say it, more who suspect it, and all thoughtful pastors, at least, sometimes entertain the thought. Plainly, then, the time has come for looking the question squarely in the face, whether we are able to answer it to the conviction of all or not.

Why does the question come up ? What's the matter with pastoral visiting that its utility or desirability is doubted ? Is it a reflection upon the wisdom of the fathers who used it as, in their judgment, an indispensable part of their work as pastors of the flock ? Not at all. One must be dull or narrow-minded who cannot appreciate the immense value of pastoral visiting to pastor and people, as the conditions of society once permitted it to be done. Suspicion as to its value to-day is something slowly generating in the popular Christian consciousness, out of the conviction that circumstances of society have so greatly changed as materially to alter the case.

Changed conditions call for readjustment. The real question is, Can pastoral visiting be readjusted to the changed conditions which affect the relations of pastor and people ? Is the principle in the old custom flexible enough to work profitably to the life of the Church in the conditions which rule to-day ?

A moment's thought about two only of these changed conditions will clear the way to a rational conclusion. The most significant of all is the reduced official importance of the minister. The minister used to be a man plus an indefinable something, which made men respect, and women revere, and children fear him. The office carried with it an authority which it was rash in any well-ordered community to question. Now, whether for better or worse, he has been shorn of the plus part of his equipment for influence. He is reduced to the ranks of a common manhood.

An immediate result of this loss of official dignity is a reduced opportunity for usefulness in his pastoral visiting. Once the minister's coming meant the summoning of the family together, husband and children and servants, for a religious service—catechism, or reading of the Scriptures, personal conversation and prayer. Such a service was of consequence ; it was the pastor's golden opportunity. But now the husband is at his business, the children are at school, the servants are of another faith, and the pastor sees only the mother and perhaps the grown-up daughters. How lessened the opportunity for spiritual labor, and how increased the temptation for merely social visiting, every faithful pastor must painfully appreciate.

The loss by the minister of the special authority which once warranted his pastoral oversight of the homes of his congregation has been step by step attended by a loss of special protection, while at pastoral work, from the misinterpretation of his motives by other men. A gentleman, not a pastor, who should make a practice of calling upon the wives of other men in their absence, would be properly regarded as wicked or weak. That society does not regard ministers as wicked is a tribute to the practically unimpeachable morals of the profession ; but many a pastor is sensitive to a feeling strong among men that it is not quite manly or dignified to be the ladies' man he is seemingly compelled, by circumstance, to be.

Another of the changed conditions of society affecting the pastoral half of the minister's duties is in the remarkably multiplied and diversified activities of the intellectual life. The age is singular in the liberty and inducements it offers men of intellectual power and training to enter callings once supposed to be beneath the dignity of such men. Many trades have blossomed into professions, and technical schools, which compete with the universities for the bright young graduates of the high schools, are turning out hundreds of men every year highly educated in these practical professions. The intelligence of the hand labor classes is being quickened as never before; and from the laboratories of great original investigators, down to the humblest shops where mechanics at the bench mull over great scientific, social, and industrial questions, the call comes to the spiritual teacher of to-day to prepare to meet quick-witted, earnest men in discussion of a thousand questions they are asking Christianity.

The minister who is alert to bring the principles of Christ to bear upon living questions, to apply the divine force in Christ to the world's life at those points where its need of redemption is most apparent and pressing, cannot afford to spend his time in small talk with the women of his congregation. They, with their husbands and sons out in the imminent peril, and supremely needing a wise, manly, Christian brother in their pastor, ought to be the last ones to exact of their minister that he shall spend his precious time and strength—and this theirs as much as his—making pastoral calls of the conventional sort upon them.

Are these, then, reasons why pastoral visiting must go? By no means. The principle inside the custom of pastoral visiting, which ever justified the custom, is an essential principle in the pastoral relation. The pastor must come into touch with his people, personally and privately, as well as preach to them. He cannot preach to them with best results unless he knows them thus. But where shall he find his people, that he may come into this touch with them? He must go where they are, and must go most and oftenest where such of his people are as need him most—in their places of work and business, in their public assemblies, on the street—wherever he can find them. He will do no less pastoral visiting; but he will do what he does more wisely, and with regard to the changed conditions of society and modern life.

But shall the women not have their share of the pastor's attention? Certainly. But what their share is must still be determined in view of the considerations which have been urged.

It is the writer's habit to try to see the inside of the homes of his people once a year. By making it the business of every pleasant afternoon, he is able to make the circuit of his parish within the three months following vacation. In this calling, at the homes and upon the ladies, he is always accompanied by his wife. The advantages of this are too apparent to need emphasis. When this visitation is concluded, he has the map of his parish freshly corrected in his memory, and knows, by recent observation, the spiritual and other conditions of all his people. This is the best possible preparation for the year's work, besides leaving him free for those pastoral labors which have been indicated as even more important for the spiritual guide of men to-day. During the rest of the year he has office hours and reception evenings, when the people are urged to seek him if they need him for any purpose. And, in addition to all this, he causes it to be distinctly understood that, if his people will excuse him from conventional pastoral calling during the remaining nine months of the year, he will be at the call of any one who needs him and will tell him so, at any time of the day or night. He will go from study or from sleep, from meals or from anything, if by going he can minister to any real need of any member of his congregation.

Pastoral visiting need not go. The principle in it is vital and flexible enough to adjust itself to any set of conditions yet arisen, or likely to arise, in society.

THE ARTICLES OF THE FAITH AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE.*

I.

Of God.

We believe in and adore one living and true God, who is spirit and the Father of spirits, present in every place, personal, infinite, and eternal, the almighty Author and sovereign Lord of all; most blessed, most holy, and most free; perfect in wisdom, justice, truth, and love; to us most merciful and gracious; unto Whom only we must cleave, Whom only we must worship and obey. To Him be glory forever! Amen.

---

* We reprint from *The New York Evangelist* of October 31st, 1889, the new creed of the Presbyterian Church of England.—Ed.

II.

Of the Trinity.

We acknowledge, with the ancient Church, the mystery of the Holy Trinity as revealed in Scripture, and believe that in the unity of the ever-blessed Godhead there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, of one substance, equal in power and glory.

III.

Of Creation.

We believe that Almighty God, for His own holy and loving ends, was pleased in the beginning to create the heavens and the earth, by the Son, the Eternal Word; and through progressive stages, to fashion and order this world, giving life to every creature; and to make man in His own image, that he might glorify and enjoy God, occupying and subduing the earth, and having dominion over the creatures, to the praise of his Maker's name.

IV.

Of Providence.

We believe that God the Creator upholds all things by the word of His power, preserving and providing for all His creatures, according to the laws of their being; and that He, through the presence and energy of His Spirit in nature and history, disposes and governs all events for His own high design; yet is He not in any wise the author or approver of sin, neither are the freedom and responsibility of man taken away, nor have any bounds been set to the sovereign liberty of Him who worketh when and where and how He pleaseth.

V.

Of the Fall.

We believe and confess that our first father, Adam, the representative head as well as common ancestor of mankind, transgressed the commandment of God through temptation of the devil, by which transgression he fell, and all mankind in him, from his original state of innocence and communion with God; and so all men have come under just condemnation, are subject to the penalty of death, and inherit a sinful nature, degenerate in every part, and estranged from God, from which proceed all actual transgressions: and we acknowledge that out of this condition no man is able to deliver himself.

VI.

Of Saving Grace.

We believe and proclaim that God, Who is rich in mercy as well as of perfect justice, was moved by His great love to man to hold forth from the first a promise of redemption, which from age to age He confirmed and unfolded, and that, in the fulness of the time, He accomplished His gracious purpose by sending His Son to be the Saviour of the world: wherefore our salvation out of sin and misery is ever to be ascribed to free and sovereign grace.

VII.

Of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe in and confess, with the ancient Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who, being the Eternal Son of God, became man by taking to Himself a true body and soul, yet without sin, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary; so that He is both God and Man, two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the divine and the human, being inseparably joined together in one person, that He might be the Mediator between God and man, by Whom alone we must be saved.

VIII.

Of the Work of Christ.

We believe that the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, being anointed with the Holy Spirit to proclaim and set up the Kingdom of God among men, did by His perfect life on earth, through words and deeds of grace, declare the Father, Whose image He is: and did fully satisfy divine justice, and obtain for us forgiveness of sins, reconciliation to God, and the gift of eternal life, through His obedience on our behalf to the law and will of His Father, even unto the death of the cross, wherein, bearing our sins, He offered Himself up a sacrifice without spot to God.

IX.

Of the Exaltation of Christ.

We believe that Jesus Christ, being for our offences crucified, dead, and buried, saw no corruption, but was raised again on the third day, in Whose risen life we live anew, and have the pledge of a blessed resurrection; that in the same body in which He rose, He ascended into heaven, where, as our High Priest, He maketh continual intercession for us; and that He sitteth at the right hand of God, Head of the Church, clothed with authority and power as Lord over all.

X.

Of the Gospel.

We hold fast and proclaim that God, Who willeth that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, has, by His Son our Saviour, given commission to the Church to preach unto all nations the Gospel of His grace, wherein He freely offers to all men forgiveness and eternal life, calling on them to turn from sin, and to receive and rest by faith upon the Lord Jesus Christ.

XI.

Of the Holy Spirit.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of life, Who worketh freely as He will, without Whose gracious influence there is no salvation, and Whom the Father never withholds from any who ask for Him; and we give thanks that He has in every age moved on the hearts of men; that He spake by the prophets; that through our exalted Saviour He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten the minds of men in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the Spirit of truth, of holiness, and of comfort.

XII.

Of Election and Regeneration.

We humbly own and believe that God the Father, before the foundation of the world, was pleased of His sovereign grace to choose a people unto Himself in Christ, whom He gave to the Son, and to whom the Holy Spirit imparts spiritual life by a secret and wonderful operation of His power, using as His ordinary means, where years of understanding have been reached, the truths of His Word in ways agreeable to the nature of man; so that, being born from above, they are the children of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.

XIII.

Of Justification by Faith.

We believe that every one, who through the quickening grace of the Holy Spirit repents and believes the Gospel, confessing and forsaking his sins, and humbly relying upon Christ alone for salvation, is freely pardoned and accepted as righteous in the sight of God, solely on the ground of Christ's perfect obedience and atoning sacrifice.

XIV.

Of Sonship in Christ.

We believe that those who receive Christ by faith are vitally united to Him, and become partakers in all the benefits of His redemption; that they are adopted into the family of God; and that they have the Spirit of His Son abiding in them, the earnest of their inheritance.

XV.

Of the Law of the New Obedience.

We believe and acknowledge that the Lord Jesus Christ has laid His people by His grace under new obligation to keep the perfect Law of God; and that by precept and example He has enlarged our knowledge of that Law, and illustrated the spirit of filial love in which the divine will is to be obeyed.

XVI.

Of Christian Perseverance.

We bless God that the obedience of Christians, though in this life always imperfect, is yet accepted for Christ's sake and pleasing to God, being the fruit of union to Christ and the evidence of a living faith; and that in measure as they surrender themselves to His Spirit and follow the guidance of His Word, they receive strength for daily service, and grow in holiness after the image of their Lord; or if, through unwatchfulness and neglect of prayer, any of them fall into grievous sin, yet by the mercy of God who abideth faithful they are not cast off, but are chastened for their backsliding, and through repentance restored to His favor, so that they perish not.

XVII.

Of the Church.

We acknowledge one holy catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who, being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their Head, are one body in Him, and have communion with their Lord and with one another: further, we receive it as the will of Christ that His Church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, organized for the confession of His name, the public worship of God, the upbuilding of the saints, and the proclamation of the Gospel; and we acknowledge, as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, as Divine Lord and Saviour.

XVIII.

Of Church Order and Fellowship.

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole Head of His Church, has appointed its worship, teaching, discipline, and government to be administered, according to His will revealed in Holy Scripture, by officers chosen for their fitness, and duly set apart to their office; and although the visible Church, even in its purest branch, may contain unworthy members, and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren: which fellowship is to be extended, as God gives opportunity, to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

XIX.

Of Holy Scripture.

We believe that God, who manifests Himself in creation and providence, and especially in the spirit of man, has been pleased to reveal His mind and will for our salvation at successive periods and in various ways; and that this Revelation has been, so far as needful, committed to writing by men inspired of the Holy Spirit, so that the Word of God is now contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are therefore to be devoutly studied by all: and we reverently acknowledge the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures to be the Supreme Judge in questions of faith and duty.

XX.

Of the Sacraments.

We acknowledge Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the two Sacraments instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation, as signs and seals of the new covenant, ratified in His precious blood; through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and to be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world: Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost being the sacrament of admission into the visible Church, in which are set forth our union to Christ and regeneration by the Spirit, the remission of our sins, and our engagement to be the Lord's; and the Lord's Supper, the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and of His sacrifice on the Cross, and in which they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, to their comfort, nourishment, and growth in grace.

XXI.

Of the Second Advent.

We assuredly believe that on a day known only to God, the Lord Jesus Christ will suddenly come again from heaven with power and great glory; and we look for this second appearing of our Saviour as the blessed hope of His Church, for which we ought always to wait in sober watchfulness and diligence, that we may be found ready at His coming.

XXII.

Of the Resurrection.

We believe that the souls of the righteous enter at death upon a state of rest and felicity at home with the Lord; and we look for the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God, when the bodies of all who are fallen asleep in Christ, as well as of the faithful who are then alive, shall be fashioned anew and conformed to the body of His glory.

XXIII.

Of the Last Judgment.

We believe that God will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, before whom all men must appear, who shall separate the righteous from the wicked, make manifest the secrets of the heart, and render to every man according to the deeds which he hath done in the body, whether good or evil, when the wicked shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.

XXIV.

Of the Life Everlasting.

Finally, we believe in and desire the life everlasting in which the redeemed shall receive their inheritance of glory in the kingdom of their Father, and be made fully blessed in the presence and service of God, Whom they shall see and enjoy forever and ever. Amen.

DECLARATORY STATEMENT.

Whereas this Church has ever acknowledged the canonical books of Holy Scripture to be her sole, Supreme Standard, to which the Westminster Confession of Faith is to be regarded as subordinate ;

Whereas every endeavor to set forth in the form of a Creed the truth taught in Holy Scripture, must be at the best imperfect ; and

Whereas every such Creed is liable to become less adequate to express the Church's faith, through that fuller and clearer apprehension of His revealed truth which it pleases God from time to time to grant unto His Church ;

Therefore it has seemed good and needful to this Church in Synod assembled, for the better exhibition of her belief on certain points, to declare as follows :

I.

That the doctrine of Redemption set forth in the Westminster Confession, particularly in its reference to the election of some among mankind to eternal life, is held and taught in this Church, together with other great truths which are vital to the Gospel, such as

1, That the love of God to mankind moved Him to provide, by the gift of His Son to be a propitiation for the whole world, a way of salvation which in His Gospel is freely offered to all ;

2, That God has no pleasure in the death of any sinner, but desires that all should repent and live ; and

3, That every man who hears the Gospel is responsible for his acceptance or rejection of its free offer of eternal life.

II.

That the teaching of the Confession on the subject of man's total depravity since the Fall, is not to be understood as denying his responsibility both under the Law and under the Gospel, or the existence and value of the natural virtues.

III.

That while the duty of proclaiming the Gospel to all men is clear and imperative, and while the proclamation of the Gospel is the ordinary means of salvation for all who are capable of being called thereby ; and while it is certain that no one is saved except through the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the working of the Holy Spirit : Yet it does not follow, nor is it required to be held, either that any who die in infancy are lost, or that God may not extend His mercy to those who are beyond the reach of the ordinary means of salvation, as it may seem good in His sight.

IV.

That with reference to the teaching of the Confession regarding the duty of Civil Rulers, this Church, while holding that such rulers are subject in their own province to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, does not accept anything in that document which favors, or may be regarded as favoring, intolerance or persecution.

V.

That liberty of opinion is recognized in this Church on such points of the Confession as do not enter into the substance of the Faith : the Church retaining full authority to determine in any case which may arise what points fall within this description, as well as to guard against any abuse of this liberty to the injury of her unity and peace.

THE CORRESPONDENCE UNIVERSITY.*

From *The Christian Herald* (Baptist), Detroit, Mich., Nov. 28, 1889.

ARTICLES having appeared in the *Herald* concerning Correspondence University, the president asks that the other side have a hearing, and sends the following letter :

" I desire to set you right about the matter, and to request that this letter be published in your next issue as evidence that your publications have not been dictated by malice, or unchristian animus. Allow me to submit the enclosed proofs of the falsity of the charges that have been made, which are extracts from our recent publications, and to make the following observations : The origin of the press attacks was mainly due to a misunderstanding. A gentleman who has since become one of our professors addressed an inquiry concerning the University which got into the hands of a reporter whose investigation was confined to the city directory. On the supposition that our original officials were all residents of Chicago, and finding that persons of somewhat similar names (though in all cases with initials more or less different) were given in the directory as men of inferior occupations, he at once made this the basis of a newspaper sensation similar to one that had had perhaps, some foundation, and which had been made a few weeks before concerning another institution. Later, this publication led to some feeling, and a garbled report of an interview with me was published, the true character of which may be seen from the fact that my reply, after its acceptance, was later suppressed, but a promise given that the mistake should not be repeated.

---

* Having reprinted from *The Christian Herald* in our November number (p. 90), an article entitled " Honorary (?) Degrees," in which the Correspondence University comes in for uncomplimentary mention, we think it only fair to reprint the reply made by the president of that institution.—ED.

"The publication gave rise, in some cases, to honest misapprehension, and in other cases to attacks that were criminally outrageous, certain religious newspapers having grossly falsified, one in particular going so far as to assert that its editor had himself seen circulars of this University representing Albert G. Harkness, of Madison University, as its president, and refusing to make or allow us to make a correction, thus forcing me to denounce it in a circular letter to over one thousand newspapers of the United States. The fact is that there is absolutely no foundation for a single charge.

"With a legal charter and a full Board of Directors, a present corps of full professors numbering thirty-eight, exclusive of all Associate professors, but including many eminent professors of colleges and some fifteen clergymen, it hardly seems necessary to meet all the slurs and misrepresentations that have been made; but I will add that no professor's name has ever been used without authority or even retained in our circulars after his resignation has been accepted, even though at great cost, as was sometimes the case. So far, not a single graduate has been shown to be unworthy, which the very fact that our graduates are mainly post-graduates of the best colleges in the land and are often clergymen of city churches would substantiate.

"As for myself, I claim to have managed the University over five years without criticism, to have been indebted to no one for a single, essential feature, and to have brought it to a point when with its new organization it promises to have over 500 students before the present year is over and to carry on a work which meets the approval of every person who fully investigates it, and which will be truly national in its extent and character. The tuition has been reduced, elaborate courses of study, as extensive as those of any American college or university, have been adopted, and hundreds of devoted friends may be counted in all the States of the Union. We now propose to erect a building (for which I have myself agreed to give $5,000) and to develop in this country the University Extension System of England.

"I am glad of your attack on honorary degrees, but acknowledge no one more earnestly opposed to it than myself.

"Finally, it should be stated that Chautauqua University does grant 'degrees conferred by Harvard and Yale and our leading theological seminaries' and not mere certificates. We have been pioneers, but we shall soon have many followers. Trusting that you will do this simple justice and thus remedy somewhat the wrong done, I am very truly yours,

"F. W. HARKINS, President."

AGNOSTICISM.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.

(Continued from the December number, p. 179.)

IT had "the advantage" again, of being "offensive to the persons attacked," when Professor Huxley, in an article in this review on "Science and the Bishops," in November, 1887, said that "scientific ethics can and does declare that the profession of belief" in such narratives as that of the devils entering a herd of swine, or of the fig-tree that was blasted for bearing no figs, upon the evidence on which multitudes of Christians believe it, "is immoral;" and the observation which followed, that "theological apologists would do well to consider the fact that, in the matter of intellectual veracity, Science is already a long way ahead of the churches," has the same "advantage." I repeat that I cannot but treat Professor Huxley as an example of the more refined sort of controversialist; it must be supposed, therefore, that when he speaks of observations or insinuations which are somewhat offensive to the "persons attacked" being dear to the other sort of controversialist, he is unconscious of his own methods of controversy—or, shall I say, his own temptations?

But I desire as far as possible to avoid any rivalry with Professor Huxley in these refinements—more or less—of controversy; and am, in fact, forced by pressure both of space and of time to keep as rigidly as possible to the points directly at issue. He proceeds to restate the case as follows: "The agnostic says, 'I cannot find good evidence that so and so is true.' 'Ah,' says his adversary, seizing his opportunity, 'then you declare that Jesus Christ was untruthful, for he said so and so'—a very telling method of rousing prejudice." Now that superior scientific veracity to which, as we have seen, Professor Huxley lays claim, should have prevented him putting such vulgar words into my mouth. There is not a word in my paper to charge agnostics with declaring that Jesus Christ was "untruthful." I believe it impossible in these days for any man who claims attention—I might say, for any man—to declare our Lord untruthful. What I said, and what I repeat, is that the position of an agnostic involves the conclusion that Jesus Christ was under an "illusion" in respect to the deepest beliefs of his life and teaching. The words of my paper are, "An agnosticism which knows nothing of the relation of man to God must not only refuse belief to our Lord's most undoubted teaching, but must deny the reality of the spiritual convictions in which he lived and died." The point is this—that there can, at least, be no reasonable doubt that Jesus Christ lived, and taught, and died, in the belief of certain great principles respecting the existence of God, our relation to God, and his own relation to us, which an agnostic says are beyond the possibilities of human knowledge; and of course an agnostic regards Jesus Christ as a man. If so, he must necessarily regard Jesus Christ as mistaken, since the notion of his being untruthful is a supposition which I could not conceive being suggested. The question I have put is not, as Professor Huxley represents, what is the most unpleasant alternative to belief in the primary truths of the Christian religion, but what is the least unpleasant; and all I have maintained is that the least unpleasant alternative necessarily involved is, that Jesus Christ was under an illusion in his most vital convictions.

I content myself with thus rectifying the state of the case, without making the comments which I think would be justified on such a crude misrepresentation of my argument. But Professor Huxley goes on to observe that "the value of the evidence as to what Jesus may have said and done, and as to the exact nature and scope of his authority, is just that which the agnostic finds it most difficult to determine." Undoubtedly, that is a primary question; but who would suppose from Professor Huxley's statement of the case that the argument of the paper he is attacking proceeded to deal with this very point, and that he has totally ignored the chief consideration it alleged? Almost immediately after the words Professor Huxley has quoted, the following passage occurs, which I must needs transfer to these pages, as containing the central point of the argument: "It may be asked how far we can rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects. Now it is unnecessary for the general argument before us to enter on those questions respecting the authenticity of the gospel narratives, which ought to be regarded as settled by M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case. *Apart from all disputed points of criticism, no one practically doubts that our Lord lived, and that he died on the cross, in the most intense sense of filial relation to his Father in heaven, and that he bore testimony to that Father's providence, love, and grace toward mankind. The Lord's Prayer affords sufficient evidence upon these points. If the Sermon on the Mount alone be added, the whole unseen world, of which the agnostic refuses to know anything, stands unveiled before us. There you see revealed the divine Father and Creator of all things, in personal relation to his creatures, hearing their prayers, witnessing their actions, caring for them and rewarding them. There you hear of a future judgment administered by Christ himself, and of a heaven to be hereafter revealed, in which those who live as the children of that Father, and who suffer in the cause and for the sake of Christ himself, will be abundantly rewarded. If Jesus Christ preached that sermon, made those promises, and taught that prayer, then any one who says that we know nothing of God, or of a future life, or of an unseen world, says that he does not believe Jesus Christ.*"

Professor Huxley has not one word to say upon this argument, though the whole case is involved in it. Let us take as an example the illustration he proceeds to give. "If," he says, "I venture to doubt that the Duke of Wellington gave the command, 'Up, Guards, and at 'em!' at Waterloo, I do not think that even Dr. Wace would accuse me of disbelieving the duke." Certainly not. But if Professor Huxley were to maintain that the pursuit of glory was the true motive of the soldier, and that it was an illusion to suppose that simple devotion to duty could be the supreme guide of military life, I should certainly charge him with contradicting the duke's teaching and disregarding his authority and example. A hundred stories like that of "Up, Guards, and at 'em!" might be doubted, or positively disproved, and it would still remain a fact beyond all reasonable doubt that the Duke of

Wellington was essentially characterized by the sternest and most devoted sense of duty, and that he had inculcated duty as the very watchword of a soldier ; and even Professor Huxley would not suggest that Lord Tennyson's ode, which has embodied this characteristic in immortal verse, was an unfounded poetical romance.

The main question at issue, in a word, is one which Professor Huxley has chosen to leave entirely on one side—whether, namely, allowing for the utmost uncertainty on other points of the criticism to which he appeals, there is any reasonable doubt that the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount afford a true account of our Lord's essential belief and cardinal teaching. If they do—then I am not now contending that they involve the whole of the Christian creed ; I am not arguing, as Professor Huxley would represent, that he ought for that reason alone to be a Christian—I simply represent that, as an agnostic, he must regard those beliefs and that teaching as mistaken—the result of an illusion, to say the least. I am not going, therefore, to follow Professor Huxley's example and go down a steep place with the Gadarene swine into a sea of uncertainties and possibilities, and stake the whole case of Christian belief as against agnosticism upon one of the most difficult and mysterious narratives in the New Testament. I will state my position on that question presently. But I am first and chiefly concerned to point out that Professor Huxley has skilfully evaded the very point and edge of the argument he had to meet. Let him raise what difficulties he pleases, with the help of his favorite critics, about the Gadarene swine, or even about all the stories of demoniacs. He will find that his critics—and even critics more rationalistic than they—fail him when it comes to the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount, and, I will add, the story of the Passion. He will find, or rather he must have found, that the very critics he relies upon recognize that in the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, allowing for variations in form and order, the substance of our Lord's essential teaching is preserved. On a point which, until Professor Huxley shows cause to the contrary, can hardly want argument, the judgment of the most recent of his witnesses may suffice—Professor Reuss, of Strasburg. In Professor Huxley's article on the " Evolution of Theology" in the number of this review for March, 1886, he says, " As Reuss appears to me to be one of the most learned, acute, and fair-minded of those whose works I have studied, I have made most use of the commentary and dissertations in his splendid French edition of the Bible." What, then, is the opinion of the critic for whom Professor Huxley has this regard ? In the volume of his work which treats of the first three Gospels, Reuss says at page 191–92. " If anywhere the tradition which has preserved to us the reminiscences of the life of Jesus upon earth carries with it certainty and the evidence of its fidelity, it is here ;" and again : " In short, it must be acknowledged that the redactor, in thus concentrating the substance of the moral teaching of the Lord, has rendered a real service to the religious study of this portion of the tradition, and the reserves which historical criticism has a right to make with respect to the form will in no way diminish this advantage." It will be observed that Professor Reuss thinks, as many good critics have thought, that the Sermon on the Mount combines various distinct utterances of our Lord, but he none the less recognizes that it embodies an unquestionable account of the substance of our Lord's teaching.

But it is surely superfluous to argue either this particular point, or the main conclusion which I have founded on it. Can there be any doubt whatever, in the mind of any reasonable man, that Jesus Christ had beliefs respecting God which an agnostic alleges there is no sufficient ground for ? We know something at all events of what his disciples taught ; we have authentic original documents, unquestioned by any of Professor Huxley's authorities, as to what St. Paul taught and believed, and of what he taught and believed respecting his Master's teaching ; and the central point of this teaching is a direct assertion of knowledge and revelation as against the very agnosticism from which Professor Huxley manufactured that designation. " As I passed by," said St. Paul at Athens, " I found an altar with this inscription : 'To the unknown God.' Whom therefore ye ignorantly—or in agnosticism—worship, Him I declare unto you." An agnostic withholds his assent from this primary article of the Christian creed ; and though Professor Huxley, in spite of the lack of information he alleges respecting early Christian teaching, knows enough on the subject to have a firm belief " that the Nazarenes, say of the year 40," headed by James, would have stoned any one who propounded the Nicene Creed to them, he will hardly contend that they denied that article, or doubted that Jesus Christ believed it. Let us again listen to the authority to whom Professor Huxley himself refers. Reuss says at page 4 of the work already quoted:

> Historical literature in the primitive church attaches itself in the most immediate manner to the reminiscences collected by the apostles and their friends, directly after their separation from their Master. The need of such a return to the past arose naturally from the profound impression which had been made upon them by the teaching, and still more by the individuality itself of Jesus, and on which both their hopes for the future and their convictions were founded. . . . It is in these facts, in this continuity of a tradition which could not but go back to the very morrow of the tragic scene of Golgotha that we have a strong guarantee for its authenticity. . . . We have direct historical proof that the thread of tradition was not interrupted. Not only does one of our evangelists furnish this truth in formal terms (Luke i. 2); but in many other places besides we perceive the idea, or the point of view, that all which the apostles know, think, and teach, is at bottom and essentially a reminiscence—a reflection of what they have seen and learned at another time, a reproduction of lessons and impressions received.

Now let it be allowed for argument's sake that the belief and teaching of the apostles are distinct from those of subsequent Christianity, yet it is surely a mere paradox to maintain that they did not assert, as taught by their Master, truths which an agnostic denies. They certainly spoke, as Paul did, of the love of God; they certainly spoke, as Paul did, of Jesus having been raised from the dead by God the Father (Gal. i. 1); they certainly spoke, as Paul did, of Jesus Christ returning to judge the world; they certainly spoke, as Paul did, of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. xi. 31). That they could have done this without Jesus Christ having taught God's love, or having said that God was his Father, or having declared that he would judge the world, is a supposition which will certainly be regarded by an overwhelming majority of reasonable men as a mere paradox; and I cannot conceive, until he says so, that Professor Huxley would maintain it. But if so, then all Professor Huxley's argumentation about the Gadarene swine is mere irrelevance to the argument he undertakes to answer. The Gospels might be obliterated as evidence to-morrow, and it would remain indisputable that Jesus Christ taught certain truths respecting God, and man's relation to God, from which an agnostic withholds his assent. If so, he does not believe Jesus Christ's teaching; he is so far an unbeliever, and "unbeliever," Dr. Johnson says, is an equivalent of "infidel."

This consideration will indicate another irrelevance in Professor Huxley's argument. He asks for a definition of what a Christian is, before he will allow that he can be justly called an infidel. But without being able to give an accurate definition of a crayfish, which perhaps only Professor Huxley could do, I may be very well able to say that some creatures are not crayfish; and it is not necessary to frame a definition of a Christian in order to say confidently that a person who does not believe the broad and unquestionable elements of Christ's teachings and convictions is not a Christian. "Infidel" or "unbeliever" is, of course, as Professor Huxley says, a relative and not a positive term. He makes a great deal of play out what he seems to suppose will be a very painful and surprising consideration to myself, that to a Mohammedan I am an infidel. Of course I am; and I should never expect a Mohammedan, if he were called upon, as I was, to argue before an assembly of his own fellow-believers, to call me anything else. Professor Huxley is good enough to imagine me in his company on a visit to the Hazar Mosque at Cairo. When he entered that mosque without due credentials, he suspects that, had he understood Arabic, "dog of an infidel" would have been by no means the most "unpleasant" of the epithets showered upon him, before he could explain and apologize for the mistake. If, he says, "I had had the pleasure of Dr. Wace's company on that occasion, the undiscriminative followers of the Prophet would, I am afraid, have made no difference between us; not even if they had known that he was the head of an orthodox Christian seminary." Probably not; and I will add that I should have felt very little confidence in any attempts which Professor Huxley might have made, in the style of his present article, to protect me, by repudiating for himself the unpleasant epithets which he deprecates. It would, I suspect, have been of very little avail to attempt a subtle explanation, to one of the learned mollahs of whom he speaks, that he really did not mean to deny that there was one God, but only that he did not know anything on the subject, and that he desired to avoid expressing any opinion respecting the claims of Mohammed. It would be plain to the learned mollah that Professor Huxley did not believe either of the articles of the Mohammedan creed—in other words that, for all his fine distinctions, he was at bottom a downright infidel, such as I confessed myself, and that there was an end of the matter. There is no fair way of avoiding the plain matter of fact in either case. A Mohammedan believes and asserts that there is no God but God, and that Mohammed is the prophet of God. I don't believe Mohammed. In the plain, blunt, sensible phrase people used to use on such subjects I believe he was a false prophet, and I am a downright infidel about him. The Christian creed might almost be summed up in the assertion that there is one, and but one God, and that Jesus Christ is his prophet; and whoever denies that creed says that he does not believe Jesus Christ, by whom it was undoubtedly asserted. It is better to look facts in the face, especially from a scientific point of view. Whether Professor Huxley is justified in his denial of that creed is a further question, which demands separate consideration, but which was not, and is not now, at issue. All I say is that his position involves that disbelief or infidelity, and that this is a responsibility which must be faced by agnosticism.

But I am forced to conclude that Professor Huxley cannot have taken the pains to understand the point I raised, not only by the irrelevance of his argument on these considerations, but by a misquotation which the superior accuracy of a man of science ought to have rendered impossible. Twice over in the article he quotes me as saying that "it is, and it ought to be, an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ." As he winds up his attack upon my paper by bringing against this statement his rather favorite charge of "immorality"—and even "most profound immorality"—he was the more bound to accuracy in his quotation of my words. But neither in the official report of the congress to which he refers, nor in any report that I have seen, is this the statement attributed to me. What I said, and what I meant to say, was that it ought to be an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly "that he does not believe Jesus Christ." By inserting the little word "in," Professor Huxley has, by an unconscious ingenuity, shifted the import of the statement. He goes on to denounce "the pestilent doctrine on which all the churches have insisted, that honest disbelief in their more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offence, indeed a sin of the deepest dye." * His interpretation exhibits, in fact, the idea in his own mind, which he has doubtless conveyed to his readers, that I said it ought to be unpleasant to a man to have to say that he does not believe in the Christian creed. I certainly think it ought, for reasons I will mention; but that is not what I said. I spoke, deliberately, not of the Christian creed as a whole, but of Jesus Christ as a person, and regarded as a witness to certain primary truths which an agnostic will not acknowledge. It was a personal consideration to which I appealed, and not a dogmatic one; and I am sorry, for that reason, that Professor Huxley will not allow me to leave it in the reserve with which I hoped it had been sufficiently indicated. I said that "no criticism worth mentioning doubts the story of the Passion; and that story involves the most solemn attestation, again and again, of truths of which an agnostic coolly says he knows nothing. An agnosticism which knows nothing of the relation of man to God must not only refuse belief to our Lord's most undoubted teaching, but must deny the reality of the spiritual convictions in which he lived and died. It must declare that his most intimate, most intense beliefs, and his dying aspirations were an illusion. Is that supposition tolerable?" I do not think this deserves to be called "a proposition of the most profoundly immoral character." I think it ought to be unpleasant, and I am sure it always will be unpleasant, for a man to listen to the Saviour on the cross uttering such words as "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and to say that they are not to be trusted as revealing a real relation between the Saviour and God. In spite of all doubts as to the accuracy of the Gospels, Jesus Christ—I trust I may be forgiven, under the stress of controversy, for mentioning his sacred name in this too familiar manner—is a tender and sacred figure to all thoughtful minds, and it is, it ought to be, and it always will be, a very painful thing, to say that he lived and died under a mistake in respect to the words which were first and last on his lips. I think, as I have admitted, that it should be unpleasant for a man who has as much appreciation of Christianity, and of its work in the world, as Professor Huxley sometimes shows, to have to say that its belief was founded on no objective reality. The unpleasantness, however, of denying one system of thought may be balanced by the pleasantness, as Professor Huxley suggests, of asserting another and a better one. But nothing, to all time, can do away with the unpleasantness, not only of repudiating sympathy with the most sacred figure of humanity in his deepest beliefs and feelings, but of pronouncing him under an illusion in his last agony. If it be the truth, let it by all means be said; but if we are to talk of "immorality" in such matters, I think there must be a lack of moral sensibility in any man who could say it without pain.

The plain fact is that this misquotation would have been as impossible as a good deal else of Professor Huxley's argument,

---

* Page 32

had he, in any degree, appreciated the real strength of the hold which Christianity has over men's hearts and minds. The strength of the Christian Church, in spite of its faults, errors, and omissions, is not in its creed, but in its Lord and Master. In spite of all the critics, the Gospels have conveyed to the minds of millions of men a living image of Christ. They see him there; they hear his voice; they listen, and they believe him. It is not so much that they accept certain doctrines as taught by him, as that they accept him, himself, as their Lord and their God. The sacred fire of trust in him descended upon the apostles, and has from them been handed on from generation to generation. It is with that living personal figure that agnosticism has to deal; and as long as the Gospels practically produce the effect of making that figure a reality to human hearts, so long will the Christian faith, and the Christian Church, in their main characteristics, be vital and permanent forces in the world. Professor Huxley tells us, in a melancholy passage, that he cannot define "the grand figure of Jesus." Who shall dare to "define" it? But saints have both written and lived an *imitatio Christi*, and men and women can feel and know what they cannot define. Professor Huxley, it would seem, would have us all wait coolly until we have solved all critical difficulties, before acting on such a belief. "Because," he says, "we are often obliged, by the pressure of events, to act on very bad evidence, it does not follow that it is proper to act on such evidence when the pressure is absent." Certainly not; but it is strange ignorance of human nature for Professor Huxley to imagine that there is no "pressure" in this matter. It was a voice which understood the human heart better which said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" and the attraction of that voice outweighs many a critical difficulty under the pressure of the burdens and the sins of life.

Professor Huxley, indeed, admits, in one sentence of his article, the force of this influence on individuals.

> If (he says) a man can find a friend, the hypostasis of all his hopes, the mirror of his ethical ideal, in the pages of any, or of all, of the Gospels, let him live by faith in that ideal. Who shall, or can, forbid him? But let him not delude himself with the notion that his faith is evidence of the objective reality of that in which he trusts. Such evidence is to be obtained only by the use of the methods of science, as applied to history and to literature, and it amounts at present to very little.

Well, a single man's belief in an ideal may be very little evidence of its objective reality. But the conviction of millions of men, generation after generation, of the veracity of the four evangelical witnesses, and of the human and divine reality of the figure they describe, has at least something of the weight of the verdict of a jury. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* Practically the figure of Christ lives. The Gospels have created it; and it subsists as a personal fact in life, alike among believers and unbelievers. Professor Huxley himself, in spite of all his scepticism, appears to have his own type of this character. The apologue of the woman taken in adultery might, he says, "if internal evidence were an infallible guide, well be affirmed to be a typical example of the teachings of Jesus." Internal evidence may not be an infallible guide; but it certainly carries great weight, and no one has relied more upon it in these questions than the critics whom Professor Huxley quotes.

But as I should be sorry to imitate Professor Huxley, on so momentous a subject, by evading the arguments and facts he alleges, I will consider the question of external evidence on which he dwells. I must repeat that the argument of my paper is independent of this controversy. The fact that our Lord taught and believed what agnostics ignore is not dependent on the criticism of the four Gospels. In addition to the general evidence to which I have alluded, there is a further consideration which Professor Huxley feels it necessary to mention, but which he evades by an extraordinary inconsequence. He alleges that the story of the Gadarene swine involves fabulous matter, and that this discredits the trustworthiness of the whole Gospel record. But he says:

> At this point a very obvious objection arises and deserves full and candid consideration. It may be said that critical scepticism carried to the length suggested is historical pyrrhonism; that if we are to altogether discredit an ancient or a modern historian because he has assumed fabulous matter to be true, it will be as well to give up paying any attention to history. . . . Of course (he acknowledges) this is perfectly true. I am afraid there is no man alive whose witness could be accepted, if the condition precedent were proof that he had never invented and promulgated a myth.

The question, then, which Professor Huxley himself raises, and which he had to answer, was this: Why is the general evidence of the Gospels, on the main facts of our Lord's life and teaching, to be discredited, even if it be true that they have invented or promulgated a myth about the Gadarene swine?

(*To be continued.*)

GOODLY WORDS.

Original translations from Meister Eckart, by C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

(*Continued from page* 180.)

(Mart. xxii.) Just in the proportion as a man denies himself by God's help and becomes united with God, he is more God than man. When man is entirely liberated from self and lives in God only, he becomes in *Grace* the selfsame which God is by Nature, and God recognizes that there is no difference between Himself and that man. I said in Grace. God is good by nature, but the man is good by grace.

(Mart. xxii.) God is ever and always active in the now of eternity. His activity is the bringing forth of His Son. Him He is bringing forth always. The Son is the Firstbegotten from the fruitfulness of the Divine nature, and this begetting is without any medium; therefore He is called the Image and the Word of the Father. In this Word God speaks my soul and thine. He brings forth His Son in the soul in the same way as in Eternity He brings Him forth, and in no other way. The Father brings forth His Son unceasingly; yea, I will say more still: He brings forth me as His son; yea, He brings forth me as His being and essence. Then I flow forth in the Holy Spirit; then there is one life, one being, and one work.

(Mart. xxii.) I do not thank God that He loves me, He cannot do otherwise, nor does He wish to do otherwise. I thank Him because it is impossible for Him to deny (go back on) His Godhead.

(Mart. xxiii.) When the Will is so united that it becomes a One in oneness, then does the Heavenly Father generate (*gebiert*) his only begotten Son in Himself and in me. Why in Himself and in *me?* Because I am one with Him; He cannot exclude me. From the selfsame act proceeds the Holy Ghost; hence from me, too. Why? I am in God. If the Holy Ghost derives not His being from me, too, He derives it not from God. I am in nowise excluded.

(Mart. xxiii.) God has not only become man, He has assumed human *nature.*

(Mart. xxiii.) It is the Father's Being to bring forth the Son; it is the Being of the Son to be born, *and that I am brought forth in Him.* It is the Being of the Holy Spirit that I be burned in Him and be melted to pure love.

(Mart. xxiv.) The Father brings forth His Son in the righteous man. All the virtue of a righteous man and all his good work is the bringing forth of the Son by the Father. The Father does not rest till His Son is born in me; He forces me to bear the Son. Wise people ought to know this, and common people must believe it.

(Mart. xxiv.) It is possible for me to attain to the highest unity which Christ ever had with the Father, if I could divest myself of individuality and put on the Universal Human.

(Mart. xxiv.) The Lord said: "All things that I heard from My Father I have made known unto you." All that the Father has and is, the abyss of His being and nature, He brings forth in His Son, the Onlybegotten; it is this the Son hears from the Father, and he has revealed to us, that *we* are this selfsame Son. God has become man, that I may become God. God has died, that I may die from the world and its things.

(Mart. xxv.) The righteous man serves neither God nor the creature; he is free.

(Mart. xxv.) A master has said: A soul loving God, loves Him because of Goodness. But I say that Being is more worth than Goodness. Because were Being not, Goodness would *be* neither, and only as far as Goodness has Being in it, is it Goodness.

(Mart. xxv.) God has several names, but the greatest name is "Being." All that is weak and mortal is sinking away from Being. So far as our life is Being, so far it is in God. There is no life, be it ever so mean and poor, if you consider it Being, it is nobler than all, that ever was alive. If you consider a flower in its Being, it is nobler than the whole world.

(Mart. xxv.) The will may be satisfied with the Goodness of God, but the reason will find rest neither in Goodness, nor in Wisdom, nor in Truth, nor in God Himself, so long as He is God merely. She seeks God as the marrow from which Goodness flows; she wills God as the pith from which Goodness springs; she seeks God as the root from which Goodness sprouts; she goes down to the ground, from where Truth and Goodness proceed; she lays hold of them in the Beginning (*in principio*), before they can be named. She wills God only as He is in Himself, when Goodness and all names are laid aside. She is not satisfied with the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, but penetrates to the deepest deep, to the root, from which spring the Son and the Holy Spirit.

(Mart. xxv.) God's goodness does not insure my Salvation; neither would I ask God to save me for goodness' sake. Perhaps He wills not to save me. This is my Salvation that God is rational and that I know it.

(Mart. xxv.) All the Created is unfree. He alone is a righteous man who has put off all creation, because there is no truth in it.

(Mart. xxvi.) St. Paul said: "By the grace of God I am what I am." These words are true, and yet Grace was not in him. Grace had been at work, that Being might come. After Grace had done its work, Paul was as he was *originally.* In that state all difference between God and man disappears. Therefore do I ask God to liberate me from God, because *Being* is above and beyond God and all differences.

(Mart. xxvii.) When I rested in first principles, I had no God, I was my own self; I willed not; I asked for nothing; I was simply a being and knew myself in divine Truth. That which I willed, that I was; and that which I was, I willed, and I was free from God and all Thing. As soon as I left my Freedom and entered my created existence, I got a God—In the time before the creatures were, God was not God. He was as He was. When the creatures came forth and received their created existence, then God was no more God in Himself, but God in Creatures.

(Mart. xxviii.) So long as I remained in the Ground of the Deity, in the Abyss of the Deity, in the Source of the Deity, nobody asked about my volitions or my intentions. When I stepped out, I heard all creation talk about God.

Why did they talk about God and not about the Deity? In the Deity all is like unto itself, is one, and you can say nothing about it.

God and the Deity are not equivalent terms. God is active and creating. The Deity does nothing, but rests in itself, is still and immovable. When I return to the Deity, my transition is better than my exit, because I bring all creatures back with me in my Reason. When I shall have arrived in the Ground of the Deity, shall have come to the Source of the Deity, nobody will ask me whence I come, where I have been, and nobody shall have missed me. Here terminates all Becoming.

PARAGRAPHIC.

[Copy of President Washington's first Thanksgiving Proclamation. From *The Congregationalist.*]

BY THE
PRESIDENT
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.
A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS it is the Duty of all Nations to acknowledge the Providence of Almighty God, to obey his Will, to be grateful for his Benefits, and humbly to implore his Protection and Favour: And whereas both houses of Congress have, by their join Committee, requested me, "To recommend to the People of the UNITED STATES, a Day of PUBLIC THANKSGIVING and PRAYER, to be observed by acknowledging with grateful Hearts the many signal Favours of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a Form of Government for their Safety and Happiness."

NOW THEREFORE, I do recommend and assign THURSDAY the TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER next, to be devoted by the People of these States, to the Service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be: That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks for his kind Care and Protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation;—for the signal and manifold Mercies, and the favourable Interpositions of his Providence in the Course & Conclusion of the late War;—for the great Degree of Tranquility, Union and Plenty, which we have since enjoyed;—for the peaceable and rational Manner in which we have been enabled to establish Constitutions of Government for our Safety and Happiness, and particularly the national one now lately instituted;—for the civil and religious Liberty with which we are blessed, and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge;—and in general, for all the great and various Favours which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

AND ALSO, that we may then unite in most humbly offering our Prayers and Supplications to the great LORD and RULER of Nations, and beseech him to pardon our National and other Transgressions;—to enable us all, whether in public or private Stations, to perform our several and relative Duties properly and punctually;—to render our national Government a Blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just and Constitutional Laws, directly and faithfully executed and obeyed;—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and nations, (especially such as have shown kindness unto us) and to bless them with good Government, Peace and Concord;—to promote the Knowledge and Practice of true Religion and Virtue, and the increase of Science among them and us;—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a Degree of temporal Prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my Hand, at the City of New York, the third Day of October, in the year of our Lord One Thousand, Seven hundred and eighty nine.

G. WASHINGTON.

THE Bishop of Peterborough must bestir himself or, as it seems, he will be left behind at the present rate of progress by his brother of Oxford. Bishop Stubbs has added to the conundrum which he propounded last spring when he asked, "Why he himself was like Homer," giving the reply, "Because they had both suffered from translation." Finding that one of his officials was continually quoting the practice that prevailed during Bishop Wilberforce's reign, he addressed him thus: "Mr. Archdeacon, can you tell me why you are like the Witch of Endor?" When the posed functionary professed himself unable to give the answer, the bishop added, "Because you are continually endeavoring to raise the spirit of Samuel."—*The Churchman, Nov.* 2, 1889.

THE PROFESSORS IN THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.—The professors in the Divinity school of the great Roman Catholic University at Washington have all been appointed, and are all foreign born.

The chair of dogmatic theology has been given to the Rev. Dr. Schroeder, who comes from the university of Cologne. He has studied theology at Rome, and after a three-years' course in philosophy and a four-years' course in theology, was raised to priesthood in 1874. The member of the University who is to have control of the discipline of the students is Father Hogan. He was born in Ireland, was educated in Paris, and for thirty years taught in a Roman Catholic institution there. Some five years ago he came to this country. The professor in philosophy, the Rev. Dr. Pohle, was born in Germany, and educated in Rome and Wurzburg. He has taught in Leeds, England, and Fulda, Germany, and from the latter place came to Washington. The lecturer in canon law is Father Messmer, born in Switzerland and educated at Innspruck, the most Jesuitical of Jesuit colleges. Messmer has been in this country for some time. The professor in moral Theology is Professor Bouquillo, late at Lille. He was born and educated in Belgium. Biblical science is to be taught by the Rev. Dr. Hyvernant, at present engaged in scientific studies in Egypt. He is a Frenchman. The Rev. Dr. Graf, a German by birth and a Frenchman by education and professional experience, is to direct the musical part of the curriculum.—*The Churchman, Dec.* 7, 1889.

SUNDAY IN ST. PETERSBURG.—Twelve hundred St. Petersburg merchants have declared themselves willing to close their places of business on Sunday, with a view of keeping the day as it is understood in the United States and Great Britain. The movement cannot succeed. The Greek Church compels cessation of work in whole or in part on more than seventy man-made holidays. Until this is reformed, the people will have to work on Sunday.—*The Christian Advocate.*

THE following amusing recipe, "How to compose a sermon," is by Dr. Salter, who was Master of the Charterhouse from 1761 to 1778. "Take some scraps out of the best books you have; weigh them, and sift them thoroughly; then divide them into three parts, for dividing them into more is generally thought to crumble them too much. Work these well and handle them neatly, but neither mince nor chop them. Season the whole with a due proportion of salt, put in nothing that is too hard or difficult to digest, but let all be clear and candid; it should have some fire, for that will raise it and prevent it being heavy. You must garnish it with a few flowers, but not so thick as to hide the substance. Take care it is not overdone, for, as it is the last thing served up, if it is not inviting some of the company may not taste of it. In a hard frost or extreme cold weather, it should be done in twenty minutes; in more temperate weather it may take half an hour. If it is done in a quarter of an hour it is fit for a king."

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

ESSAYS IN BIBLICAL GREEK. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan, 1889. 8vo, pp. 293. $2.75.

This "chip" from an English workshop makes us want to see a solid block from the same source. It contains the substance of the writer's Grinfield lectures on the Septuagint, and is one of the freshest, most scholarly, stimulating, and helpful books which has issued from the English press in a long time. It will open the eyes of uncritical readers of the Greek Testament, and it formulates and voices, in part, at least, what has been for some years growing in the minds of scholars, to wit, the vital importance of the Septuagint and of the Old Testament Apocrypha for the correct interpretation of New Testament Greek.

From the splendid exegetical work of such English scholars as Lightfoot and Westcott, the impression has gained ground that the language of the New Testament has been the subject of the most careful and critical study. Hence the statement will come to many as a surprise that "the language of the New Testament has not yet attracted the attention of any considerable scholar;" that "there is no good lexicon, no philological commentary, no adequate grammar." "In our own university," continues the author, "there is no professor of it, but only a small endowment for a terminal lecture and four small prizes." The contrast of this meagre provision with the results of Oriental studies, and the ample facilities for their prosecution, is suggestive and not pleasant, and carries a significant reminder to the theological schools in America where the same tendency is painfully apparent.

Yet no one familiar with the exegetical literature of the New Testament can rise from the perusal of this book without feeling that these statements, strong as they are, are substantially justified by the facts; for it is clearly evident that even in the work of the most eminent modern exegetes, the Septuagint does not occupy the position and influence which are vindicated for it in these essays. It is the classical and not the Hebræo-Greek standard which has been applied to the verbal exegesis of the New Testament. The general identity of biblical and classical Greek has been tacitly assumed; and "in almost every lexicon, grammar, and commentary, the words and idioms of the New Testament are explained, not, indeed, exclusively, but chiefly, by a reference to the words and idioms of the Attic historians and philosophers. . . . Almost any average scholar who can construe Thucydides is supposed to be thereby qualified to criticise a translation of the gospels."

In any attempt to define the character of New Testament Greek, several elements must be taken into account. That it is a peculiar language is recognized on all hands; but the precise definition of its peculiarities and their causes is a more difficult matter. The changes fall into two general classes due to two different causes. The one class consists of those inevitable modifications incident to the history of every living language, resulting from the external pressure of new social and political conditions, and from the internal drift of the language itself. The other class is the outgrowth of the contact of an Aryan with a Semitic race. Hence the former class finds its parallels in all contemporary Greek; while for the parallels of the other we must look to another literature and to the forms of thought peculiar to another race.

The influence of Alexander's conquests in throwing open the Attic idiom to the inroads of provincialism is a familiar fact; but the changes from this cause were mainly changes in verbal or literary form; while those wrought by the contact of the Greek with the Oriental, struck down into a deeper region. The fusion in Alexandria was not merely a dialectic fusion; it was a fusion, more or less complete, of ideas; an effort to dress Moses in the garb of the Platonists and Stoics; and when the Jew, all over the East, adopted the language of Greece, he forced it to carry ideas which were not its own.

Dr. Hatch graphically pictures the effect of this passage of the Greek language into a new country. It appears prominently in its metaphors. The word-pictures take on a Syrian coloring. Life, which, in the busy streets of Athens is conceived as *ἀναστρόφη*, *conversation*, assumes the Syrian conditions of painful travel over hard roads, and becomes a *journey*. "A change in conduct is the turning of the direction of travel (*ἐπιστρέφεσθαι*). The hindrances to right conduct are the stones over which a traveller might stumble, or the traps or tanks into which he might fall in the darkness (*σκάνδαλα*, *προσκόμματα*, *παγίδες*, *βόθυνοι*). The troubles of life are the burdens which the peasants carried on their backs (*φορτία*). Again, the common employments of the Syrian farmers gave rise to the frequent metaphors of sowing and reaping, of sifting the grain and gathering it into the barn (*σπείρειν*, *θερίζειν*, *σινιάζειν*, *συνάγειν*); the threshing-floor furnished a metaphor for a devastating conquest, and the scattering of chaff by the wind for utter annihilation (ἀλοᾶν, λικμᾶν)."

A new stamp, moreover, was set upon biblical Greek by the different religious and moral ideas of the race which spoke it. There was a radical difference between the religious conceptions of the men whose theological manual was Homer, and of those who studied Moses. The attitude of the latter toward human nature, life, and God, forced the Greek words to become symbols of ideas which were not Greek. Μακάριος, which passed up through the Psalms into the Sermon on the Mount, differed from the μάκαρ of Homer and the μακάριος of Pindar as character differs from circumstance, or heavenly felicity from earthly happiness; and there is a long stretch from the dominant classical conception of δίκαιος as having its basis in social usage, to that which appears in Habbakuk's words, "The just shall live by faith."

What we have to find out, therefore, in studying biblical Greek is "what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind." To read it simply in the light of Homer, Plato, and Thucydides is to read it without its true key.

In discussing the value of the Septuagint for this study, Dr. Hatch shows that in the fact of the Septuagint being so largely a free or paraphrastic translation from the Hebrew, we have a guard against a too restricted literalism in the rendering of words in biblical Greek, since we are shown, both in another language and in another form, the precise extent of meaning which a word or a sentence was intended to cover. We are shown how many different Greek words express the shades of meaning of a single Hebrew word, and, conversely, how many different Hebrew words explain the meaning of a single Greek word.

After illustrating the free rendering of the Septuagint under the heads of glosses and paraphrases, variations of metaphor, and variations of rendering particular words and phrases, he lays down the following inferences and general rules to be applied to the investigation of the meanings of words in the New Testament. These words fall into two general classes. The first class embraces (*a*) Certain words common to biblical and contemporary secular Greek, which, since they are designations of concrete ideas, are not appreciably affected by the Semitic element. Thus, γλωσσόκομον was originally a box for keeping the mouthpieces of musical instruments. This meaning it loses in later Greek, being used in the Septuagint of the Ark of the Covenant, the contribution-chest of Joash, and the coffer into which the jewels of gold were put when the ark was sent back. This latter meaning of "a strong box" is recognized in later Attic Greek, and passes into the New Testament in John xii. 6; xiii. 29, where it is used of the common chest of the disciples. (*b*) Certain words, common to biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, expressing abstract ideas, do not vary in biblical use from their secular use; as is shown by the fact that they are found only in those parts of the New Testament where the style is least affected by Semitic conceptions and forms of speech. Thus δεισιδαίμων, which in classical Greek has a good sense, *religious*, passes, in later Greek, into the meaning of *superstitious*, as is shown by its use in Philo, Josephus, and Plutarch; so that it would seem to have had, in the first century and a half of the Christian era, a depreciatory sense, not only in secular but in Christian usage, as appears from Justin Martyr. This fact throws doubt upon the prevailing modern exegesis of Acts xvii. 22, which endeavors to soften Paul's assertion that the Athenians were "rather superstitious," by giving the word its original rather than its contemporary sense. It was probably this consideration which influenced the Revisers of 1881 in retaining *superstitious*, where the American committee insisted on *religious*.

The second class embraces those words which form a great majority in the New Testament, and which, though for the most part common to biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, express in their biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race, and must consequently be examined by the light of the cognate documents which form the Septuagint.

"These words are so numerous, and a student is so frequently misled by his familiarity with their classical use, that it is a safe rule to let no word, even the simplest, in the New Testament, pass unchallenged. The process of inquiry is (1) to ascertain the classical use of a word, (2) to ascertain whether there are any facts in relation to its biblical use which raise a presumption that its classical use had been altered. Such facts are afforded partly by the context in which the word is found, but mainly by its relation to the Hebrew words which it is used to translate."

The temptation to cite illustrations of the applications of these principles to New Testament words is very strong. We are glad to see such positive testimony to "covenant" as the *invariable* sense of διαθήκη, "especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the Septuagint as the Epistle to the Hebrews." A distinction is brought out between two special senses of οἰκονόμος, both of which occur in the New Testament—namely, the *house*-steward, and the *land*-steward. Hence in Luke xvi. point is given to the *land*-steward's remark, "I cannot *dig*," since a degraded bailiff might be reduced to the status of a farm-laborer. So, in Rom. xvi. 23, the οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως is probably the administrator of the city lands. Πονηρός occurs in Sirach in the sense of *niggardly*, and the corresponding Hebrew word is also sometimes rendered, as in Proverbs, by βάσκανος, with a similar reference to the "evil" or "grudging" eye. This throws light upon the use of the word in Matt. vi. 23, where, from the context, the reference would seem to be, not to goodness or badness in general, but specially to the use of money. This appears to be clearly the sense in Matt. xx. 15. The meaning of "advocate" or "helper" is vindicated for παράκλητος instead of "comforter," which, Dr. Hatch truthfully says, is not required by any passage in St. John.

But we must briefly notice, in conclusion, the relation of the Septuagint to the psychological terms in the New Testament. Others have preceded Dr. Hatch in this field, notably Wendt, in his monograph, "Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch" (1878), and Professor Dickson in his well-known and most admirable volume, "St. Paul's use of the terms Flesh and Spirit" (1883), which is largely based upon Wendt. To the discussion of the Septuagint usage of these terms, a section is added on their usage by Philo, with the conclusion that Paul's usage differs essentially from Philo's, and that, therefore, the Pauline psychology cannot be interpreted by the Philonean. Dr. Hatch's discussion goes to establish the conclusion which is rapidly gaining ground among students of Paul's writings, that the more subtile metaphysical distinctions between καρδία, πνεῦμα, ψυχή, are not to be looked for; and that Paul's usage is shaped by that of the Septuagint, where they appear interchanged as translations of the same Hebrew words. "A survey of the predicates which are attached to each of them shows a similar impossibility of limiting them to special groups of mental phenomena, with the exception that καρδία is most commonly used of will and intention, ψυχή of appetite and desire."

We have not space to notice the chapter on early quotations from the Septuagint, which is of great value.

Dr. Hatch's book will not only help to assert for New Testament Greek its true place and function, but will also tend to emphasize the elucidation of the New Testament as the true objective-point of Semitic study, and the Septuagint as the true medium of the normal and closer relation between the two.

The style is unpretentious and lucid. An index of Greek words would be helpful. No student of the New Testament can afford to be without the book.

Marvin R. Vincent.

The Story of Phœnicia. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, etc. (The Story of the Nations Series.) New York: Putnam's Sons. 12mo, pp. xvii., 356. Cloth. Illustrated. Map. $1.50.

Like the other volumes of this series, this one is printed in good readable type and on excellent paper. The binding is artistic and appropriate. In outward appearance it is of such a character as to make it a pretty book. Only one matter in the mechanical make-up of the volume could be improved—namely, the restoration of some few letters that have fallen out of place and the replacing of some imperfect letters by others whose corners have not suffered violence.

The author has not prefaced his book by any remarks to tell us what the limits of his task are. We are left to infer from the title that it was not his intention to go beyond the point at which Phœnicia ceased to have an independent existence, and consequently we do not find any account of the fortunes of the land since the final conquest by the Romans. But even within these limits, this work, like all other of a similar sort, has the character of a tentative effort. It is not possible to say the last word yet in regard to any of the peoples of Western Asia, where we are expecting new discoveries every day. The merit of a work on any one of them lies in the extent to which the facts of most recent discoveries are made accessible. The completest book is the one that not only gives us all that which, having been heretofore known and stated, has stood the test of criticism, but also at the same time brings down the tale to the very date of publication. The years are strewn with books which have served their purpose and which are now only as mile-stones to mark the progress of knowledge. The same may be said of the present volume, for it will by no means be considered as the last word on the subject.

The materials for the history of Phœnicia are very much scattered. The remark of Pietschmann ("Geschichte der Phœnizier," p. 3), will long remain true, to the effect: "To-day and for a long time to come it will be impossible to avoid the impression that the representation of Phœnician history is made up of a mosaic of disjointed notes even when one does not merely heap up the details of a dry learning." To go thoroughly into the subject requires an amount of research that is simply amazing to the uninitiated. References must be gathered from the cuneiform records and from the hieroglyphic and "hieratic" writings of Egypt. The Greek and Latin historians must be searched through and their story learned. The scattered notices of the land and people contained in the Old Testament must be sifted and studied. Of modern books on the subject there are not many, but the notes and scraps of information are scattered through periodicals and the proceedings and transactions of the learned societies. The classics on Phœnicia have been Movers and Kendrick, but the book that will replace them will undoubtedly be that of Richard Pietschmann in Oncken's series.

The present book does not pretend to be a complete and exhaustive study of the subject, or if it does it falls short of its aim. It deals in the first place with the land and people, the geography of the former and the characteristics of the latter. Then the colonies and the early history of the efforts of the people in navigation, the connection that they had with the Hebrews, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans are treated in order. Here the history comes to a close. The final chapters are taken up with an account of their architecture, manufactures, and works of art, their language, writing, and literature. The story is told in a pleasing way, though there is too much that is technical for a popular book and not enough of detail for a book of reference. But evidently the former is the class in which it is to be placed, and further criticism is, perhaps, uncalled for. For scholarly purposes it lacks the references to the literature which are so marked a feature in the work of Pietschmann.

We note that in speaking of the navigation of the Phœnicians no notice is taken of the late work of Lieblein on their traffic in the Red Sea. The plan of the work excluded mention of the Punic and Carthaginian settlements, except that a long account of the settlement of Carthage is given in quotation from an unnamed "German critic." It may be apprehended that all will not readily agree with the account of Asherah as the name of the symbol or figure under which Astarte was worshipped (p. 110). The account of the writing of the Phœnicians is also very partial, and the arguments of those who suppose that it was derived from the Egyptian are put aside too readily and with too little reason. It is certainly an extreme statement that there are resemblances between the Phœnician and Egyptian letters only in three or four cases and exact likeness only in one. It must be borne in mind that a long interval existed between the time when the Phœnicians became acquainted with the Egyptians and their culture and the time whence we have any remains of their literature—if it is worthy of the name. And it is further to be remarked that the system of comparison between the letters of the Phœnicians and the complete and perfect hieroglyphics of ancient Egypt is very unfair. The ordinary signs used in business transactions cannot have been these, but rather the more easily-made and the currently-used "hieratic" or even "demotic" writing. It is not possible thus easily to brush aside the work of De Rouge on this interesting topic, to say nothing of the work of Taylor ("The Alphabet").

To the general reader the work will afford a means of gaining a rapid glance at the interesting story of these early and adventurous voyagers, but to the student it will afford comparatively little aid. It will not serve as a guide because the literary signboards have been omitted. Incidentally it appears (p. 294) that the book was written in 1887, and hence some allowance is to be made, but on the whole we lay the book down with some degree of disappointment.

C. R. GILLETT.

NAMES AND PLACES IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA, WITH THEIR MODERN INDENTIFICATIONS. Compiled by GEORGE ARMSTRONG, and revised by COLONEL SIR CHARLES W. WILSON and MAJOR CONDER. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Alexander P. Watt, 2 Paternoster Square (London), 1889. 12mo, pp. 190, 24. 3s. 6d.

The compiler of this work tells us in the preface that he has made the list from the various publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund, from Smith's Bible Dictionary, from Clark's Bible Atlas, and from some of the works of Major Conder. The identifications are those adopted in the maps of the Fund made under the direction of Wilson and Conder. The Old Testament list contains "upward of 1150 names of places in the Holy Land, Mesopotamia, Edom, the Desert of Sinai, and Egypt; being, it is believed, all those that are mentioned in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha." The New Testament list contains 162 names, "of which 144 are known, 10 uncertain, and 8 not identified." Two hundred and ninety of the Old Testament places still await identification.

The compilation proposes to be a gazetteer of the places mentioned in the Bible and the Old Testament Apocrypha. But at the same time it is such only under certain limitations which greatly damage its usefulness as a book of reference. As a geographical index to the publications of the Fund it is valuable, and to a considerable extent also as an independent work, but not so far as might have been wished or as it might easily have been made. Without extending the number of pages or adding to the cost of type-setting there might have been packed a much larger amount of information that would have added very materially to the value of the book and made it more than a mere adjunct of the works that have been published by the Fund. This will appear when we glance at the make-up of the work.

In its arrangement the book is perspicuous. But according to the present plan it is at the expense of much blank space on each page. There are five columns on a page. The first contains the name of the place to be treated printed in heavy-faced type. But the space is so narrow that a very large number of the names have to be run on the second line or in some cases on a third. This makes it more difficult for the eye to take in the name at a glance. This interferes slightly with the rapid use of the book, though it is not a very severe fault. The second column contains the references to the passages in Scripture where the name occurs, and is printed in ordinary type. The third gives the identifications as far as possible, and is printed in italics. The fourth contains references to the Fund's map on some particular sheet of which the place in hand is found. The last column is the most important. At the same time it is in connection with it that we are most likely to find fault. The room that is devoted to the "Remarks and References" is by far too restricted. We expect to find here the full statement with regard to the reasons that have led to the identifications and references to the authorities so that the work may be kept within our control. But lack of space, despite the exercise of considerable power of condensation, has rendered it impossible to do justice to this part of the work.

It is evident that the various material that enters into the several columns will necessarily be a very variant factor. In one case the references to Scripture take much space and there is no call for extended remark as to identification or proof. At another the citations are few and there is call for a large amount of proof and general statement. The result is evident. The sections are ill balanced and there is much valuable space lost. If the book had been printed like any other book, there could have been effected a saving of nearly if not quite one-half of the size of the book, or an addition of nearly one hundred per cent to its contents and a still larger percentage to its value.

There is no apparent reason why the compiler should have shut his eyes to the results of investigators and explorers other than those connected with the Palestine Fund. We look in vain for any recognition of the work done by Naville and others under the auspices of the Egypt Fund. What is said of Pithom, for instance, is very insufficient. With regard to Succoth the statements are insufficient in one case and false in another. It is said that Succoth was "the first camping-place on leaving Egypt." In a sense this is true, but as Succoth is now known to be identical with Pithom, and to be in Egypt, it is a false statement. But the further assertion that the place is "not identified," shows ignorance. Goshen is said to be "near the Eastern side of the ancient Delta." But this statement is such as to give little or no information as to the locality in question. Why not give the latest opinion, even if it is considered to be subject to later modification, and locate it in the Wadi Tumilat, along the line of the modern railway from Zagazig to Ismaïlia?

It is not evident why the compiler has seen fit to separate the list of Old Testament names from that of the New. Yet such is the arrangement, and one must be careful not to miss any of the information that is contained in the book by failure to look in both.

In its present shape the work is of service mainly in connection with a Bible Dictionary. It will serve to bring down the facts to a later date and to supply some facts that are known as the result of investigations made since the dictionaries issued from the press. But it is to be greatly regretted that the compiler did not adopt a different plan when he made up his book, and that he did not allow himself to go outside of the works of his Fund for information that would have added very materially to its value and have given us a handbook that should have occupied a place much more prominent than that to which we must assign the present edition. C. R. Gillett.

The Redemption of Man. Discussions Bearing on the Atonement. By D. W. Simon, Ph.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. 8vo, $4.

Dr. Simon, principal of the Congregational Theological Hall at Edinburgh, has given to the public in this volume, a valuable collection of essays on the redemption of man. These are so suggestive and strong in their presentation of the doctrine of redemption, as set forth in the Scriptures and by the leaders of the Protestant Reformation, that we regret that the author did not work them over with other material into an organic system. Dr. Simon has unusual critical sagacity. He is familiar with the history of doctrine, especially since the Reformation, and he uses his knowledge with great skill. He shows that the leaders of modern orthodoxy have departed from the Scriptures and the faith of the Reformation in several important particulars in the doctrine of redemption. The introduction is a long essay of 68 pages, in which there is a critical classification of the various theories of the atonement. His first group is the *objective* theories, embracing the *crypto dualistic* and the *Godward* theories. Under the *crypto dualistic* he includes not only the mediæval theory, that Christ's death was a ransom to the devil; but also the modern theory, that it was a satisfaction to an external law. Under this head he discusses the so-called "orthodox" theory of satisfaction to divine justice, as taught by Turretine, Crawford, and the Hodges. He shows that their theory of *judicial* satisfaction really makes the divine justice something apart from God to which God Himself is obliged to conform. He also shows that God's justice exacts something more of men than penalty for sin—"Justice can be done to God only by the redemption of man." "Every sinner condemned to eternal death is an eternal loss to God." "Theologians have concealed from themselves, unintentionally the true nature of the position they were taking up, by substituting abstractions like 'divine justice,' 'the law,' and so forth, for God, whenever they got directly face to face with it; and unwittingly they often lapsed either into dualism or subjectivism." In this connection Dr. Simon shows that the Hodges have forsaken the older view, that the sufferings of Christ were a full and perfect equivalent for the penalty of sinners (not in duration but in intensity), and have taken an intermediate view that they were such only as the divine justice demanded of the Substitute. This "'Old-school' Presbyterian view is neither one thing nor the other—a half-way house occupied by travellers whose faces are set 'New-school' way."

The "*Godward*" theories are introduced by some profound remarks, among which we shall quote the following:

"The theological custom of speaking of the *justice* of God having its claims might suggest the idea that this was one of the ends of Christ's work which a Godward theory might have to consider. But the justice of God is merely an abstract way of speaking of God as just, of the just God. God is just; therefore He gives to every one his due. God is holy; therefore He seeks to preserve and secure what is due to Himself. In speaking of rendering justice to God, we use words of wide scope. What is due to God? Not as I have already remarked the punishment of sinners; that is the due of sinners, which God, through the cosmic order, which is the expression of His mind and will, renders to them; but the *sinners themselves are His due,* with all their powers of body and mind. . . . The limitation of the scope of justice to penalty and the like has been a mistake fraught in the history of the Christian Church down to the present moment, with the saddest consequences alike to theology and practice, to intellect and heart" (pp. 29–30).

Dr. Simon brings into prominence the fact that the Reformers made much of the anger of God and represented the passion of Christ as a propitiation to God, who was displeased, angry, indignant at sin. "By degrees, however, the anger of God ceased to be mentioned, save as a kind of synonym of God's fixed purpose to punish sin; or of the threatenings of the law; or of the necessity that sin be punished, and so forth; and this has continued to be the custom down to the present day." Later on Dr. Simon gives a chapter to the consideration of the anger of God, which is full of instruction, closing with the sentence: "He has doubtless cause to be angry with all men; but He is as far as possible from being equally angry with all; and, accordingly, while from some He does but for a moment hide His face, and others are chastened, others, again, have to feel the weight of His hand, there may be those whom He is compelled by self-consistency and holiness to cast into the outer darkness" (p. 262).

Under the head of the *Godward* theories there are careful criticisms of Maurice, Gess, Dorner, Campbell, Newman Smythe, and Edward White.

The second group of theories are the so-called "moral" theories, embracing especially the *governmental* theory and *dynamic* theories. Under the *governmental* theory Dr. Simon discusses the views of Wace, Albert Barnes, Gilbert, and many others; under the dynamic theories he reviews Magee, F. W. Robertson, and Schleiermacher. In his first chapter Dr. Simon treats of "The Atonement and the Kingdom of God." He maintains that the "end of the mission of Christ was to establish the kingdom of God, not in the *de jure* sense, for in that sense it already existed, but in the *de facto* sense; in other words, to realize the kingdom of heaven." The second chapter discusses the "Constitution of Humanity," showing that we must consider man as an individual and also mankind as an organism; and the problem of the passion of Christ needs to be approached from both sides if it is to be adequately treated. The third chapter, on "The Relations of Man to God," contains many profound thoughts. "Man can never become an object of indifference to God." "No creature constitutes a cosmos of its own within which it shall be independent of God." "Were man's nature true, it would go out in reverence as surely as the magnetic needle turns to the north." "Trust toward God is rooted in our creaturehood." "Love, however, is the crown or ripe blossom of personal relations." "Neither God nor man can be satisfied till reverence and trust are taken up and transformed into love." The corporate relations of man to God are also carefully considered, both ethically and historically, and especially at the point of representation. The normal relation is thus stated: "The function of the representative would have been, as has been said, to combine, as in a focus, what is otherwise broken up and scattered; to provide it fit and adequate expression; to make known also to the individual members the life of the whole; and thus to render it possible for them at once to ratify and share it" (p. 139). He then shows that the history of Israel was typical in this regard. Chapter IV. is a careful study of the "Hebrew Sin-offerings with Ethnic Parallels," Chapter V. treats of "The Anger of God," Chapter VI., on "The Forgiveness of Sin," is a very important chapter. It shows how modern orthodoxism has departed from the faith of the Reformation and the Scriptures in this particular. "The Bible never associates forgiveness and punishment," and yet modern divines limit forgiveness of sin to the removal of the penalty. Dr. Simon carefully considers all the passages of Scripture treating of forgiveness of sin, and quotes largely from the Reformers, and then shows how the scholastic Protestants changed the faith, identified forgiveness with freedom from penalty, and imputed righteousness with worthiness of reward or life. This fault is common to New-school and Old-school theologians in modern times. But the climax is reached in Dr. Charles Hodge, who says: "'A pardoned criminal is not only just as much a criminal as he was before, but his sense of guilt and remorse of conscience are in no degree lessened. Pardon can remove only the outward and arbitrary penalty. The sting of sin remains.'"

Dr. Simon justly exclaims, in view of such language, and other similar citations: "And this is the theology that claims to be *par excellence* biblical and 'orthodox,' according to the recognized standards and divines of Protestantism!"

Dr. Simon justly says: "God does not forgive us as Sovereign, or as Ruler, or as Judge, but as God, who, as God, is Creator, Father, Ruler, Judge; and as such, in all these aspects, expects and claims the holding of all the specifically personal, natural relations, especially those which are described by such terms as reverence, trust, love. Forgiveness relates to the past, acceptance to the present and the future. God treats the past relation, with its failings and sins, as though it had not been; and treats the sinner again as His friend and son. The *relation* is what it should be after having been what it should not be" (p. 86).

The book closes with chapters on the Passio Christi, the Passion of Christ, the Passion of Man, the Atonement and Prayer, and the Influence of the Death of Christ—all valuable and suggestive. The author's views of redemption come out most strongly in the second of these chapters, where he tries to show that the Passion of Christ is the Passion of Man. "The Logos, who, as I said, is the whole—the human in man—stands for man—really and not assumedly or forensically, or by any fictitious, arbitrary process whatever, as the whole; and what He therefore does or suffers for the whole is, and is regarded as the doing or suffering of the whole" (p. 338). "What He has done becomes ours ; it could not be ours if it were not first of all His ; but it would be of no use to us unless it became ours ; nay, indeed, in view of the relation between Him and us, it could not be His without being potentially ours. According to Scripture, which in this is as true to human nature as it is to the moral cosmos, Christ becomes ours, and we become His by faith" (p. 341). "He becomes our Substitute, He endured our penalty, and His endurance is constituted our endurance" (p. 361).

This profound work is worthy of a more thorough exposition than we have been able to give to it. It shows that true progress in theology is to take place by a revival of the faith of the Reformation, a throwing aside the modern errors of orthodoxism, and a bringing forth of the treasures of the divine Word. C. A. BRIGGS.

A CHAPTER IN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY: BEING THE MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE FOR THE YEARS 1698–1704 TOGETHER WITH ABSTRACTS OF CORRESPONDENTS' LETTERS DURING PART OF THE SAME PERIOD. Edited by the REV. EDMUND MCCLURE, M.A., Editorial Secretary. London, 1888. 12mo, pp. vii., 375.

It is to be regretted that this "Chapter of English Church History" remains practically unwritten. No one will doubt that there are materials contained in this book which, when supplemented by facts drawn from other sources, would enable to the writing of such a chapter, and there can be no question as to the interest that it would have. But in the present volume it has not been put before the public. This publication, like all others of the same character, labors under the great disadvantage of being in the main confined to the data that the original scribe saw fit to incorporate in his records. For the most part there are only meagre notes without detail, and that there was some dissatisfaction with these minutes in particular is evident from the mention in several places of the fact that there was a committee on "defective minutes" and various attempts to perfect them.

In the preface the editor has attempted a slight review of the work of the Society during these few years, but what he there says is only in the most general terms, and leaves us with only the barest intimation of the scope of the work actually done. If he had only seen fit to have prepared a tolerably full account by way of preface, he would have placed us under obligations and have made the book far more valuable than it can be at present.

Lacking such an account by way of preface, it was natural to seek a guide through the mass of minutes in the index. It is to be recognized that the making of an index to a work like the present is no easy task. It abounds with names, and only the utmost care and the most unceasing vigilance will enable one to perform the task with success. It is little to be wondered that we find omissions of names and of references to them in the index, and a slight examination has proved that names of some importance have been overlooked. But the main fault with the index lies in the fact that there has been no attempt at all to group the entries in any sort of order of topics. In using it as it now stands one cannot be at all sure that one has not omitted mention of something that is of vital importance to the completeness of the view of any given subject. To us the part which is of greatest importance is the account of the various steps taken to extend Christian knowledge in the colonies and plantations. But to America there are only two references, to Jamaica not any, to the Barbadoes one, and the others to affairs here are scattered about under the names of the various States and cities in alphabetical order, to the great disadvantage of one who would gain a view of the whole field. But that is not the worst of it. Many of the most important references to affairs in this country are hid under the names of men of whom we have never heard, and of whom we here learn for the first time. But till we have got the desired information about any particular field and have no further use for the index, we are not in a position to be able to use it to advantage. As a case in point may be mentioned the "Proposals" of Rev. Patrick Gordon for the propagation of the Gospel among the Indians of North America. The index has no reference to the Indians, but only to Mr. Gordon. We should like to know what those proposals were, but the scribe has not left a record that is calculated to satisfy that desire. His opinion and that of the committee that declared them to be "impracticable," do not seem to have been shared by the proposer, for in several letters that are preserved in abstracted form, he shows a very keen and at times almost laughable desire to learn their fate.

It is a matter of surprise that at that time, 1699–1704, the men who organized this Society should have taken so much into their field of operations. It took up the work of the societies that had preceded it, having the reformation of the manners of the time at heart. Charity schools were established wherever it was possible, and the movement met with great success. They early entered into correspondence with evangelical Christians on the Continent. To reach the Dutch they caused books to be translated into that language. Among the sailors in the navy they caused tracts to be distributed, and if we may judge of the practices of the sailors by the literature that was to meet their wants, we should say that drunkenness and profanity abounded. Proposals were early made for the prosecution of work among the Greeks. Jamaica, the "Plantations," Virginia, New York, Pennsylvania, and New England, all came in for a share. Practically their operations were world-wide.

Covering thus a field that was too broad for a single society, we have little wonder that the appearance of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was hailed with delight, and that they went so far as to advance the money that was needed to secure the royal charter.

A few quotations will serve to show the scope of the work so far as it relates to America. In Dr. Bray's "Memorial" (p. 21) it is said: "To induce a learned, studious, and sober clergy to go into the service of the Church in those parts [the Plantations], it seems necessary that parochial libraries should be fixed in every cure of souls, consisting of some of the best books in divinity, both commentaries on the Holy Scriptures and treatises on the doctrines and duties of Christianity." Soon after we read: "As to the parochial libraries for the clergy in the Plantations, there are thirty advanced to a pretty good perfection, and a foundation laid of seventy more, in all to a value of near two thousand pounds." Books to the value of five hundred pounds were also sent for gratuitous distribution among the people of the colonies.

Subscriptions were received for the purposes of the Society in the colonies from all classes, from the king down. One contribution was of a peculiar sort. On page 31 we read:

"Dr. Bray reports that Mr. Ibbott, a minister, has given one share in Sir Humfrey Macworth's mines toward the promoting of libraries in North America."

The aid of prominent men in the Plantations, in New England, and New York was asked and secured by the Society as correspondents. The Governors of Virginia and Massachusetts, and ministers and laymen in other parts of the land were made correspondents and they seem to have done good service. Correspondence was carried on to a considerable extent, and there is frequent reference to the letters from America that were read at the stated meetings, but they have not been preserved in all cases. Where they have they contain some hints as to the state of religion here at the time. A statement in one of these letters from Mr. Elias Neau, of New York, contained in the Abstracts of Correspondence, is as follows: "That the Society has been imposed upon by the accounts of the conversion of the Quakers, there being but a few truly converted, and those which are live in great remissness. That they are so far from being able to set up schools, that they can't maintain their ministers, and that there are several places in the country where there are none. That they are overwhelmed with taxes and that their governors drain them."

It would be interesting to know what the books were which were sent for distribution in the colonies, but the minutes are almost silent on this topic. Only a few references are made to them and then they seem to have been of the usual stock, which seem to have had a peculiar attraction to these men, if we may judge from the freedom with which they distributed them among sailors, prisoners, and others, even going so far as to lead them to cause them to be translated into Dutch for distribution in Holland and in New York. Some of the titles that have been preserved to us, are as follows: A perswasive toward the observation of the Lord's day; A kind caution to profane swearers; Caution against the sin of drunkenness; Kind caution against the sin of Uncleanness. Besides these they sent at various times large and small Bibles, prayer-books, and catechisms. An appropriation of £6 was made for books for a Mr. Evans, in Philadelphia, and when the list was completed the Society did not hesitate to audit a bill for £12 11s. The reported immigration of French refugees to Virginia at once aroused their interest and aid was promptly ordered.

But books and letters were not the only things sent over. At one place we find the record: "Dr. Bray reported that nine missionaries to the Plantations are in a very fair way to be completed, £400 per annum being already subscribed, besides £50 extraordinary."

No love was lost on the Quakers, though the efforts of Robert Keith for their conversion were ably and zealously seconded. Thus we read of the Deism of William Penn, and that Pennsylvania is about half full of Quakers whom they longed to convert. They used a different word, however, when they said: "As to the reduction of Quakers, there is a subscription carrying on and considerably advanced to that purpose by some excellent persons."

But time would fail to give an adequate idea of the varied contents of this book. It is a mine from which gems may be derived, but the vast amount of dross and rubbish of routine minutes obscures their brightness. Unfortunately the index is not the guide through its mazes that it should be, and so one is left to grope along as best one may, or is tempted to throw the whole down in disgust. It is a thankless task to make such a book, and it is only fair to say that the editor seems to have done his work well, and he has certainly added to the value by the addition of foot-notes.

C. R. Gillett.

Labor and Life of the People. Vol. I., East London. Edited by Charles Booth. 1889. London: Williams & Norgate. 8vo, pp. 600. Colored map. 10s. 6d.

Every worker among the poor in London and elsewhere must rejoice in the appearance of such a work as this, which is the first scientific attempt to present facts as they are, and not as colored by vivid imaginations. Mr. Booth in this volume presents the results of three years of careful work among the poor of the "East End" in London, which throw a flood of light on the difficult problems that there meet the philanthropist. The various chapters have been contributed by specialists in their respective fields, and are as near to the truth as anything that has yet seen the light of day. When it is remembered that the population covered numbers over 900,000 souls, the magnitude of the labor involved in the attempt to gather reliable statistics may be imagined.

Mr. Booth has divided the population into six classes, according to their general condition, viewed from a financial standpoint. These are:

1. Professional classes and large shopkeepers. 2. Regular employment, good regular earnings. 3. Mixed with poverty. 4. Poor—those who have a bare income. 5. Very poor—those who are in chronic want. 6. Very poor, vicious, and semi-criminal.

A colored chart which accompanies the volume gives these divisions clearly to the eye, and is an invaluable addition to the book. Workers in that part of the city need only to consult their chart to see by the coloring what the economic condition of a given street is.

Those interested in such details will be glad to know that, although there is a vast amount of poverty in the aggregate in that part of London, yet the figures will not bear out some of the wholesale statements that have found utterance in the press from time to time. We give the figures and percentages below:

1. Well-to-do, 79,000, 8.8 per cent of the whole. 2. Regular employment, 498,000, 56 per cent of the whole. 3. Mixed with poverty, 129,000, 14.5 per cent of the whole. 4. Poor—those who have a bare income, 74,000, 8.3 per cent of the whole. 5. Very poor—those in chronic want, 100,000, 11.2 per cent of the whole. 6. Very poor, vicious, and semi-criminal, 11,000, 1.2 per cent of the whole.

These figures are far from discouraging, when we remember the total which they represent—namely, a population of 900,000 souls.

As a specimen of the detailed way in which the work has been done, I give the following representative case of the very poor but honest class:

"No. 2 furnishes another example of what I mean by very poor. Mr. R——, the father, is old and blind, and has a weekly pension of 5s. 6d. His wife only earns money hopping and fruiting. She keeps the house clean, and both she and her husband are reputed to be quite sober. There are five daughters, but one is married and gone away. The eldest at home, who ruined her health at the lead works, does sack-making or bottle-washing. The second girl works in a seed factory, and gives her mother 6s. a week. The third, similarly employed, gives 5s. to 6s., making the family house money about 17s. 6d. a week. This family live to the greatest possible extent from hand to mouth. Not only do they buy almost everything on credit from one shop, but if the weeks tested are a fair sample of the year, they every week put in and take out of pawn the same set of garments on which the broker every time advances 16s. This makes 17s. 4d. a year for the accommodation. On the other hand, even on credit they buy nothing until they actually need it. They go to their shop as an ordinary housewife to her cannisters. Twice a day they buy tea, or three times if they make it so often. In thirty-five days they made *thirty-two purchases of tea,* and of sugar *seventy-seven purchases* in the same time."

This will give some idea of the care with which the minor details of this much-to-be-prized volume have been prepared.

A. F. Schauffler.

NOTES, MAGAZINES, AND BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The Editor of the Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge returns his sincere thanks to his correspondents, Rev. President E. Dodge, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. P. Anstadt, D.D., for their kind correction of two errors in the Dictionary, which he made by following German authorities. President Dodge corrects p. 45, col. 2, l. 24 from below, so as to read: Trine immersion and pouring, the use of; and Rev. Dr. Anstadt corrects p. 61, col. 1, art. *Astrology*, l. 14, so as to omit the name of Luther, who was, as he was kind enough to show, in this respect, as in so many others, beyond his age. See Dr. Anstadt's article in the *Lutheran Observer* of December 20, 1889.

The kindness of Dr. Schaff enables us to announce a forthcoming work of his upon *Creed Revision in the Presbyterian Church*, which will contain the new creed of the Presbyterian Church of England.

Harper's New Monthly Magazine for January is the 476th number. We trust the cover, so unlike that of other magazines, will be the same on the 4760th number! Mr. Howard Pyle's "Jamaica, New and Old," fully illustrated, is followed by a Russian general's article on "The Russian Army," also illustrated, in which a tribute is paid to the sublime obedience of the Russian soldier. Mrs. L. C. Lillie handles "Two Phases of American Art"—Thomas Cole and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. The illustrations are interesting. Miss Anna C. Brackett has an excellent article on "A Woman on Horseback." Very striking are her remarks upon the essentially stupid way in which the mental education of horses is neglected. To those who like that sort of thing, "A Night at Ouseley Manor" will bring ghosts. "The Philosophy of Chinese," by Mr. John Heard, Jr., would discourage any young man contemplating going as a missionary to China. "The Smyrna Fig Harvest" and "St. Andrews"—the latter by Mr. Andrew Lang—both illustrated, close the number, except the editorial departments. But besides the articles named are stories and poems.

The Magazine of American History for January has these contributed articles: "William Cullen Bryant in History," by Mrs. Martha J. Lamb; "Rare Picture of Early New York," by Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet; "Uncle Tom's Cabin and Mrs. Stowe," by Florine Thayer McCray; "St. Anthony's Face," by Hon. J. O. Dykman; "Federal and Anti-Federal," by Hon. Gerry W. Hazleton; "Impress of Nationalites upon the City of New York," by Hon. James W. Gerard; "Ralph Izard, the South Carolina Statesman," by G. E. Manigault, M.D.; "American Republics—their Differences," by George M. Pavey.

Scribner's Magazine for January is the opening number of the seventh volume. Its first article is on "Water-storage in the West," by Walter Gillette Bates, finely illustrated. Mr. W. C. Brownell, who has won an enviable reputation by his incisive studies of French character, begins his notes and impressions of "The Paris Exposition." "The French," he quotes with approval an American commissioner as saying, "are naturally exhibition 'sharps.'" The recent exhibition was a fresh proof of their ability in that line. Mr. Brownell found the Eiffel Tower "not only not vulgar, but agreeable." This was true of the exhibition as a whole. No part was more conspicuous than that contributed by the Orient, using the term in its broadest sense. Mr. Brownell describes several of the Oriental dances. He also discourses on the pictures. "Tripoli of Barbary" is the theme of A. F. Jacassy, to which the illustrations are mostly character sketches. Mr. Henry T. Finck has a congenial theme in "The Beauty of Spanish Women." The illustrations are mostly copies. All bear out Mr. Finck's assertion of the lustre of the Spanish woman's complexion. "Electricity in the Household" is an instructive article by O. E. Kenelly. One picture, representing a sewing-machine run by electricity, is doubtless a prophecy of what will be a common sight, erelong. There is a plan of wiring a house for its various electrical appliances, including a fan which will cool its fortunate owner during hot weather. Scribner has yielded to criticism, perhaps, and furnishes an editorial department entitled "The Point of View." Besides these articles are some poems and stories.

The Atlantic Monthly for January, 1890, has one article, entitled "A Precursor of Milton," which is of theological interest. It is upon Avitus, Archbishop of Vienne, France, in the fifth century. Very little is known of him, but he has great interest from the fact, already noticed in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, that his poem in five books, drawn from Genesis and Exodus, presents so many points of similarity to Milton's "Paradise Lost" as to awaken the suspicion that Milton borrowed more than he would acknowledge from him. The other articles have the literary flavor which characterizes this magazine.

Lippincott's for January has a good deal of Hawthorne. Julian Hawthorne has the complete story of the month, "Millicent and Rosalind," and also edits his father's "Elixir of Life," a posthumous story, or rather the first instalment of it, for it is to be continued in three successive numbers of *Lippincott's*. Mr. William Westall's "Newspaper Fiction" is an article on the experiment made in England to imitate the Continental *feuilleton*. Mr. Stoddard contributes an article on "Nathaniel Parker Willis." The other articles are of divergent interest.

The Missionary Review of the World for January, 1890, is the opening number of the third volume of this periodical. We are glad to see it in a new cover. The articles in the January number are good. Dr. Pierson answers affirmatively his own question, "Is there to be a New Departure in Missions?" "Education as an Evangelistic Agency" is discussed by Rev. James Johnston, the Secretary of the late London Conference on Foreign Missions, not to be confounded with another person of the same name. Mr. Johnston, the author of the article under notice, is a well-informed, careful, and painstaking man, who has seen service in the China mission field. He is particularly qualified to speak upon his chosen theme, because he has made the educational wants of India a special study. He says that what he calls "an educational mission" "is not the normal form of missionary agency, and is only justifiable in exceptional conditions of society, of which India is the most typical example." Yet he vindicates the place of such a mission, and removes some misconceptions relating to it. The article is well worth reading. Dr. Pierson continues his series on "The Miracles of Missions," and treats of the Bishop of the Niger, Samuel Adjai Crowther, whose striking face meets us on first opening the number. Professor Henry Woodward Hulbert, of Marietta College, has a brief but instructive article on "The Historical Geography of the Christian Church," a subject to which he has paid special attention. Dr. Ellinwood writes on "Asceticism in Missions." Mr. Starbuck's department is that of condensed translations from foreign missionary magazines, and is always full of good matter. The rest of the number is filled as usual.

The Cosmopolitan for January has an attractive table of contents. Its opening article is on "Bouguereau, Artist and Man," by Carroll Beckwith. The next article is on Columbia College, by Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen. The illustrations are numerous. Mr. Mayo W. Hazeltine discourses on "Thrones that will Totter next," and without laying claim to prophetic insight, he is safe in saying that these are those of Spain, Portugal, Roumania, Servia, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Sweden. But, in fact, *all* the European thrones are tottering. "Sugar-cane and Sugar Making" (illustrated), by William H. Ballow; "The Development of the Coat and Waistcoat" (illustrated), by William Hamilton Bell; "A Cruise around Antigua" (illustrated), by Poultney Bigelow; "Famous Beauties" (illustrated), by Elizabeth Bisland; "Blenheim the Famous" (illustrated), by Charles S. Pelham-Clinton; and "The Romantic Story of a Great Corporation," aside from the fiction and the poetry and the editorial departments, make up this good number.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGY, RELIGION, AND ETHICS.

In order to meet an undoubted demand for information with regard to current publications in the field of theological science, this first instalment is sent forth, with the hope that it may prove itself of service.

ADAMS, Myron. The Continuous Creation. An application of the evolutionary philosophy to the Christian religion. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. vi., 259, crown 8vo, $1.50.

ALLEN, A. V. G. Jonathan Edwards. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, cloth, $1.25.

ALLEN, T. W. Notes on Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts. With eleven pages of fac-similes by photo-lithography. New York: Macmillan, 1889. Pp. 40, 8vo, cloth, $1.25.

ANTONINI PLACENTINI ITINERARIUM. Im unentstellten Text mit deutscher Uebersetzung. Herausgegeben von J. Gildemeister. Berlin: Reuther, 1889. Pp. xxiv., 68, 8vo, 3 mk.

ARYAN SUN MYTHS. The origin of religions. With an introduction by Charles Morris. Troy, N. Y.: Nims & Knight, 1889. Pp. 192, $1.25.

BARING-GOULD. Our Inheritance. A popular account of the Holy Eucharist during the first three centuries. New York: James Pott & Co. 8vo, cloth, $3.80.

BARTH, J. Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. 1. Hälfte. Die schlichten Nomina. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 10 mk.

BLAKE, Wilson W. The Cross, Ancient and Modern. New York: Randolph & Co. 4to, cloth, $1.50.

BRADLEE, Caleb D., D.D. Sermons for all Sects. Boston: W. B. Clarke & Co., 1888. Pp. 283, 12mo.

BRECHT, Theodor. Kirche und Sklaverei. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung des Problems der Freiheit. Barmen: Klein, 1890. Pp. iv., 227, 12mo, paper, $1.10.

BRIGGS, Charles A. Biblical History. A lecture delivered at the opening of the term of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, September 19, 1889. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. ii., 45, post 8vo, 30 cts.

BRUCE, Alexander B. (Professor, Glasgow). The Kingdom of God; or, Christ's Teachings according to the Synoptical Gospels. New York: Scribner & Welford. Pp. 344, 12mo, cloth, $2.00.

BURTON, Nathaniel J., D.D. Yale Lectures on Preaching, and other Writings. Edited by Richard E. Burton. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co. 8vo, cloth, $3.75; to ministers, $3.00.

BURY, J. B. A History of the Later Roman Empire, from Arcadius to Irene (395-800 A.D.). New York: Macmillan, 1889. 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, $8.00.

CAIRD, Edward (Professor, Glasgow). The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant. New York: Macmillan. 2 vols., 8vo, $7.50.

CASPARI, Walter (Professor Theology, Erlangen). Die evangelische Konfirmation vornämlich in der lutherischen Kirche. Erlangen and Leipzig: Böhme, 1890. Pp. 172, 8vo, paper, $1.10.

CHANDLER, Mrs. G. W. Methodist-Episcopalianism. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889. Pp. iii., 134, cloth, 65 cts.

CHANEY, George Leonard. Belief. [Discourses.] Boston: Roberts Bros. Pp. 159, 16mo, cloth, $1.00.

CLARK, Rufus W., Rev. The Church in the House: Daily Family Prayers for Morning and Evening. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 118, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

CONDER, C. R., Major. Palestine. With maps and illustrations. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 12mo, $1.25.

CONE, Orello, D.D. (Editor). Essays, Doctrinal and Practical, by Fifteen Clergymen. With an Introduction by H. W. Thomas, D.D. Boston: Universalist Publishing House, 1889. Pp. vi., 328, 12mo, $1.00.

CROOKER, Joseph Henry. Problems in American Society. Some social studies. Boston: George H. Ellis, 1889. Pp. 293, 12mo, $1.25.

DALE, R. W., LL.D. (of Birmingham). The New Evangelicalism and the Old. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889. 1s.

DALMAN, G. H. Studien zur biblischen Theologie, Der Gottesname Adonai und seine Geschichte. Berlin: Reuther. Pp. 91, 8vo, 2.80 mk.

DEEMS, Charles F., D.D. The Gospel of Common Sense. A series of discourses on the Epistle of St. James. New York: Wilbur E. Ketcham, 13 Cooper Union. Pp. 320, $1.50.

DRUMMOND, Henry. The Greatest Thing in the World. Address on 1 Cor. xiii. New York: James Pott & Co. White morocco, 35 cts.

DUFFIELD, Samuel W., the late Rev. Latin Hymn Writers and their Hymns. Edited and completed by Rev. R. E. Thompson, D.D., of the University of Pennsylvania. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

DUNN, L. R., Rev. The Gospel in the Book of Numbers. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889. Pp. 268, cloth, $1.

EDDY, Robert, D.D. (Editor). The Universalist Register; giving Statistics of the Universalist Church and other Denominational Information . . . for 1890. Boston: Universalist Publishing House. Pp. 112, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

ELY, Richard T. Social Aspects of Christianity, and other Essays. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 12mo, 90 cts.

ERDMAN, John Edward. The History of Philosophy. Translated by several English and American scholars, and edited by Professor W. S. Hough. New York: Macmillan. 3 vols., 8vo, $10.50.

EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE. Third series, 1st vol. **Watson, R. A.,** Rev. Judges and Ruth. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

FELDNER, Gundisalv. Die Lehre des heiligen Thomas von Aquin über die Willensfreiheit der vernünftigen Wesen. Eine philosophische Studie. Graz: Meyerhoff, 1890. Pp. viii., 274, 8vo, paper, $1.50.

FORBES, S. Russell. The Footsteps of St. Paul in Rome. An historical memoir, from the Apostle's landing at Puteoli to his death, A.D. 62-64. 2d edition, revised and enlarged. New York: James Pott & Co. 12mo, illustrated, cloth, 80 cts.

GILBERT, A. N. Standard Eclectic Commentary on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1890. With geographical notes by J. W. McGarvey. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co. Pp. viii., 292, map and illustrations, 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

GILBERT, George H. The Poetry of Job. Chicago: A. C. McClurg. Pp. iv., 224, 12mo, $1.00.

GLOËL, Johannes (Professor Theology, Erlangen). Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes auf ihre Berechtigung geprüft. Erlangen and Leipzig: Böhme, 1890. Pp. 96, 8vo, paper, 70 cts.

GRANT, P. W. The Revelation of St. John: An Exposition. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889. Pp. 636, 8vo, 6s.

GRIFFIS, William Elliot, D.D. The Lily among Thorns: A Study of the Biblical Drama, entitled "The Song of Songs." Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. ii., 274, 16mo, white cloth, gilt top, $1.50; plain, $1.25.

GUELDENPENNING, A. Die Kirchengeschichte des Theodoret von Kyrrhos. Eine Untersuchung ihrer Quellen. Halle: Niemeyer, 1889. Pp. 101, 8vo, 2 mk.

GWATKINS, H. M., M.A. The Arian Controversy. New York: Randolph, 1889. Cloth, 80 cts.

HAGENBACH, K. R. Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften. 12th edition. Herausgegeben von Reischle. Leipzig: Hirzel. 8vo, 7 mk.

HAMER, D. Jones. Salt and Light, and other Sermons. With portrait. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

HAMILTON, Thomas, D.D. Our Rest Day: Its Origin, History, and Claims. New York: Wilbur E. Ketcham, 13 Cooper Union. Cloth, 75 cts.

HAND-COMMENTAR ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Bearbeitet von Holtzman, Lipsius, Schmiedel, und von Soden. I. Die Synoptiker—Die Apostelgeschichte. Von Professor H. J. Holtzmann, Strassburg. Freiburg i.-B.: Mohr. 27 Bogen, 8vo, 6 mk.

HARE, George Emlen, D.D., LL.D. Visions and Narratives of the Old Testament. New York: Dutton & Co., 1889. Pp. 196, 12mo, $——.

HARPER, Henry A. The Bible and Modern Discoveries. With map and illustrations. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1889. 8vo, $4.50.

HARRIS, John Tindall. The Writings of the Apostle John. With notes, critical and expository. [Vol. I., The Gospel and Epistles, 10s. 6d.] Vol. II., The Revelation. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Royal 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

HATCH, Edwin, D.D. (Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford). Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889. 8vo, $2.75.

HAYDN, Joseph. Dictionary of Dates relating to all Ages and Nations, for Universal Reference. 19th edition, to end of 1889, by B. Vincent; with an American supplement, containing 200 additional pages, by George P. Putnam. New York: Putnam, 1889. Pp. 1094, 8vo, cloth, $5.00.

HERZOG, J. J. Abriss der gesammten Kirchengeschichte. 2d edition. Besorgt von Koffmane. Vol. I., Part I. Erlangen. Large 8vo, 7 mk.

HÜCKSTÄDT, Ernst, Dr. Der Lehrbegriff des Hirten. Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Anklam: Vereinshaus, 1889. Pp. 66, 8vo, paper, 45 cts.

HURLBUT, Jesse L., D.D. The Lesson Commentary on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1890. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Pp. xiv., 339, map and illustrations, 8vo, cloth, $1.25.

JOHANSSON, Claës Elis. (Docent, Upsala). Die Heilige Schrift und die negative Kritik. Ein Beitrag zur Apologetik. Deutsch von Joh. Claussen. Mit einem Anhange über rechte und falsche Verteidigung der Bibel von Franz Delitzsch. Autorisierte Ausgabe. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1889. Pp. iv., 240, 8vo, paper, $1.50.

KABISCH, R. Das IV. Buch Esra, auf seine Quellen untersucht. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1889. Pp. viii., 176, 8vo, 4 mk.

KEMPIS, Thomas à. The Imitation of Christ (Musica Ecclesiastica). New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 16mo, cloth, $1.00.

KILLEN, W. D. The Ancient Church: Its History, Doctrine, Worship and Constitution traced for the First Three Hundred Years. New edition, carefully revised, with Preface by J. Hall. London: Nisbet, 1889. Pp. 646, 8vo, 12s.

KOLDE, Theodor (Professor, Erlangen). Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte. 1. Wie wurde Cochleus zum Gegner Luthers? 2. Das zweite Breve Adrians an Friedrich den Weisen vom Jahre, 1522. 3. Zum Prozess des Johann Denk und "der drei gottlosen Maler von Nürnberg." 4. Nürnberg und Luther vor dem Reichstage zu Augsburg, 1530. (Abdruck aus den Kirchengeschichtlichen Studien.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. 195–263, 8vo, paper, 45 cts.

KROKER, P. Die Tugendlehre Schleiermachers mit spezieller Berücksichtigung der Tugendlehre Platos. Erlangen (Leipzig: Gräfe), 1889. Pp. 62, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

KUNST, H. Geschichte der Legenden der heiligen Katharina von Alexandrien und der heiligen Maria Aegyptiaca, nebst unedierten Texten. Halle: Niemeyer, 1890. Pp. iii., 346, 8vo, 8 mk.

LATCH, E. B. Indications of the Book of Job. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. Pp. 293, $1.00.

LICHTENBERGER, F. History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century. Translated and edited by W. Hastie. New York: Scribner & Welford. 8vo, cloth, $5.00.

LIGGINS, John. The Great Value and Success of Foreign Missions, Proved by Distinguished Witnesses. New York: Baker & Taylor Co. Pp. 249, 16 mo, paper, 35 cts.; cloth, 75 cts.

LOOFS, Friedrich (Prof. Theol., Halle). Die Handschriften der Lateinischen Uebersetzung des Irenaeus und ihre Kapiteltheilung. (Abdruck aus den Kirchengeschichtlichen Studien.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. 93, 8vo, paper, 55 cts.

LUMHOLTZ, Carl, M.A. Among Cannibals. An account of four years' travel in Australia and of camp life with the aborigines of Queensland. Translated by Rasmus B. Anderson, Ex-United States Minister to Denmark. With portrait, maps, four chromolithographs, and woodcuts. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1889. Pp. xx., 395, 8vo, $5.00.

LUTHERAN ALMANAC and Year-Book for 1890, No. 20. Edited by Matthias Sheeleigh, D. D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1889. Pp. 72, sq. 16mo, paper, 10 cts.

McCOSH, James., D.D., LL.D., etc. Whither? O Whither? Tell Me Where. New York: Scribner's Sons. 12mo, paper, 50 cts net.

McFARLANE, S., Rev. Among the Cannibals of New Guinea; being the Story of the New Guinea Mission of the London Missionary Society. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1889. Pp. 192, cloth, $1.00.

MACLAY, Arthur Collins, A.M., LL.B. Mito Yashiki. A tale of old Japan. A feudal romance descriptive of the decline of the Shogunate and of the downfall of the power of the Tokugawa family. New York and London: Putnam's Sons, 1889. Pp. viii., 456, 12mo, $1.50.

MAGOUN, G. F. Asa Turner and his Times. Boston: Congregational Sunday School & Publication Society. $1.75.

MAIR, Alexander, Rev. Studies in the Christian Evidences. New and revised edition. New York: Scribner & Welford. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

MANDEL, Th. H. Kephas der Evangelist. Studien zur Evangelienfrage. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1889. Pp. 139, 12mo, paper, 75 cts.

MANNING, Jacob Merrill, D.D. (Late Pastor of the Old South Church, Boston). Sermons. With steel portrait. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

MAURICE, F. D. The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven. A course of lectures on the Gospel of Luke. New York: Macmillan, 1889. Pp. xlviii., 368, 16mo, cloth, $1.75.

MAYOR, John E. B. The Latin Heptateuch. Published piecemeal by the French printer, W. Morel (1560), and the French Benedictines, E. Martine (1733) and J. B. Pitra (1852), critically reviewed. New York: Macmillan, 1889. Pp. lxxiv., 268, 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

MEAD, C. M. Supernatural Revelation. An essay concerning the basis of the Christian Faith. (Princeton Lectures.) New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

MELANCHTHON, Philip. Die Loci communes Philip Melanchthons in ihrer Urgestalt nach G. L. Plitt in zweiter Auflage von neuem herausgegeben und erläutert von Th. Kolde, Professor der Theologie, Erlangen. Erlangen und Leipzig: Böhme, 1890. Pp. viii., 279, 8vo paper, $1.30.

MERCER, Alexander Gardiner, D.D. Christ and His Teachings. New York: Randolph & Co. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

MICHEL,——. Die römische Kirche, ihre Einwirkung auf die germanischen Stämme und das deutsche Volk. Halle: Niemeyer, 1889. Pp. viii., 421, 8vo, 7 mk.

MOORE, Aubry L., Rev., M.A. Science and the Faith. Essays on Apologetic Subjects. (From the London Guardian.) New York: James Pott & Co. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

MURPHY, Thomas, D.D. The Presbytery of the Log College; or, the Cradle of the Presbyterian Church in America. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 526, $2.00.

NESTLE, E. De Sancta Cruce. Ein Beitrag zur christlichen Legendengeschichte. Berlin: Reuter, 1889. Pp. viii., 128, 8vo, 4 mk.

NEWTON, William Wilberforce. William Augustus Muhlenberg. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, cloth, $1.25.

ORELLI, C. von. The Prophecies of Jeremiah. (Clark's Theological Library.) New York: Scribner & Welford. 8vo, $3.00.

PARKER, Joseph, D.D. The People's Bible: Discourses upon Holy Scripture. The Book of Job. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Pp. vii., 454, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

PATON, John G. (Missionary to the New Hebrides). An Autobiography. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. $1.50.

PELOUBET, F. N. and M. A. A Commentary on the International Lessons for 1890. Explanatory, illustrative, doctrinal and practical; with illustrations, maps, pictures, chronology, and harmony of the Life of Christ. . . . Studies in the Gospel according to Luke. Boston: Wilde & Co., 1889. Pp. 348, 8vo, cloth, $1.25.

PERTHES' Handlexikon für evangelische Theologen. Ein Nachschlagebuch für das Gesamtgebiet der wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Theologie. Vollständig bis Ende 1890 in 3 Bänden. 1. Lieferung (A-Ana). Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo, paper, 40 cts.

PETAVEL, E., D.D. (Free Lecturer, University of Geneva, Switzerland.) The Extinction of Evil. Three theological essays. Translated, with an introductory chapter, by Charles H. Oliphant. The Preface by Rev. Edward White, London. Boston: Charles H. Woodman, 1889. Pp. xii., 184, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

PHELPS, Elizabeth Stuart. The Struggle for Immortality. Essays. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, $1.25.

THE

MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1. FEBRUARY, 1890. No. 5.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

SHOULD CHURCH PROPERTY BE TAXED?

BY HENRY C. VEDDER, ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF *The Examiner*, NEW YORK CITY.

THE advisability and justice of exempting from taxation property owned by religious corporations has lately been called in question by several of the religious denominations of Canada, notably by the Baptists at the recent meeting of their convention in Toronto. The occasion of the present discussion was the passage in Quebec of the Jesuits' Estates Bill, by which a gift of $400,000 was made direct from the treasury as compensation for the confiscation of Jesuit property in the year 1791. It is probable that the consciences of Canadian Protestants would not have been so preternaturally quickened, except for the circumstance that their Catholic opponents profited by this gift. Large numbers of educational and charitable institutions in Canada, under Protestant control, have received gifts amounting in the aggregate to many millions of dollars, without arousing such protest. Doubtless there have been some who have looked with disapproval upon all such appropriations of public funds to purposes private and more or less sectarian. But it is a somewhat curious circumstance that their consciences have never before compelled them to make so public and determined a protest against this vestige of union between Church and State. The present protest, indeed, lacks one element of justification that might have existed in former instances, for the reason that this payment to the Jesuits was avowedly, and, so far as we can judge, really, in some sense the fulfilment of a moral obligation. When the government of George III. forcibly confiscated the property of Canadian Jesuits, it acted without the shadow of moral right. It avowed and proceeded upon

> "The good old plan,
> That they should get who have the power,
> And they should keep who can."

When John Doe does this to Richard Roe, we call it stealing and we put John in prison, but when a sovereign power does this to its subjects it is called a stroke of statecraft. There seems to be no good reason, however, why the sovereign power that has thus stolen the property of its subjects, if in process of time the conscience of rulers should become enlightened, is not entitled and even obligated to make at least a partial restitution; and it seems hardly consistent for those who profess to be, above other men, zealous for truth and righteousness, to denounce this tardy honesty as a violation of civil and religious liberty.

The connection, therefore, does not seem to be close, either in morals or in logic, between the Jesuits' Estates Bill and the question of exempting church property from taxation. Nevertheless, it is a fact that rage caused by the one is at the bottom of the agitation against the other. Prejudice and passion are not likely to be logical. This defect has shorn of moral power many of the protests that our friends across the border have made against the principle of exempting church property from taxation. Nevertheless, let the protests have whatsoever weight seems fairly to belong to them. The resolution adopted by the Canadian Baptist Convention is as follows:

> *Whereas*, the historic belief of the Baptist Church has always been that Church and State should be separate, and that all citizens and denominations should be equal in every way before the law; and,
>
> *Whereas*, the said principle is being violated in all ecclesiastical conventions, whether in favor of the Baptists or of other denominations, in continuance of the mediæval tithing system of the Roman Catholic denomination in Quebec, in the existence of separate schools, supported out of public rates, in State provision for religious instruction in public schools, and in public grants for denominational purposes, as well as in other respects; . . .
>
> *Resolved*, that we hereby declare our conviction that the only permanent and sufficient remedy for these evils that are subversive of the principles of religious liberty and equality, and therefore a hindrance in the development of our national life, is the absolute and final separation of Church and

State and a revision of our constitution in harmony with the same.

It will be seen that this preamble and resolution classes together several things that are easily separable in principle and practice. They are not only separable, but they are actually separated in the United States. For example, the Federal and most of the State constitutions contain clauses prohibiting the appropriation of money from the public treasury for the maintenance of sectarian or denominational schools, as well as all other grants for denominational purposes. In no State in the Union has there been even a trace of a tithing system since Massachusetts, in 1833, abolished the last remnant of a State Church. No citizen of the United States would support any proposition for using moneys raised by general taxation for any private enterprises, either religious or secular. The question at issue between those who approve and those who disapprove of the exemption of church property from taxation should be distinctly defined. It is not, Shall ministers be taxed? It is not, Are the present laws relating to taxation of church property wholly just and defensible? It is not whether property held by religious corporations for purposes of revenue should be taxed. It is not even whether property held by Christian organizations only should be taxed. The real question is, whether it is good public policy, and whether the principle of complete religious liberty and separation between Church and State requires, that property should be taxed which is used exclusively for purposes of religious worship. Whether this property is a Christian church, a Mohammedan mosque or a Chinese joss house, the State need not concern itself. The theory of religious liberty requires it to treat all religions alike. Using the term "church property" in this broad sense, the inquiry properly is whether its exemption from taxation is justifiable. This restriction of the question would clip the wings of many a soaring oration that has been delivered of late, but no one need shed tears over the loss. A little less eloquence and a little more hard sense would contribute much to the solution of this vexed question. The real point at issue has been stated, and all other questions are interlopers that we may bow out with scant ceremony.

Much pretentious nonsense has been spoken and written on this question through lack of a clear conception and a precise use of the terms employed. The majority of fierce debates will be found, on close analysis, to be a wrangle over words that the disputants use in different senses. In debating this question, men have spoken of the State as if it were some mysterious power, a Spencerian Unknowable, whose ways were past finding out, whose fiats were as inexorable as those of the three weird sisters of mythology. A tax has been vaguely declaimed against as if it were some merciless engine for squeezing money out of people. *L'état, c'est moi,* said Louis XIV., summing up the whole theory of absolute monarchy in this phrase; *the State is the people* is a paraphrase that sums up the theory of democracy. Or, more precisely, the State is the people organized, through their chosen representatives engaging in self-government. The theory of the British Constitution is, that the Parliament is the people of England, not constructively but actually, and that theory lies at the base of our American governments. A tax is simply a sum assessed upon the people by themselves to defray the expenses of government. When, therefore, we translate into plain English the question, Shall the State tax church property? we simply mean, Is it necessary that the people should assess a contribution for governmental expenses upon property used for religious purposes?

It is plain that those who argue against the remission of taxes from church property, on the ground that to remit a tax is precisely the same in principle as to make a direct grant of money from the Treasury, cannot possibly maintain their ground. To make grants of money in favor of a single religious body is evidently to violate the American theory that all religious bodies are to stand on the same footing before the law. Legislation in favor of the Church by the State is repugnant to the entire American theory of Government. The American State, in fact, does not recognize the Church as such. It treats religious and secular associations of persons, bound together by a common aim, in precisely the same way. That is to say, any number of persons who desire to associate themselves for any sort of lawful purpose, whether social amusement, moral elevation, or religious worship, are permitted to incorporate themselves, and, as a corporation, may hold property and exercise other legal rights. No distinction is made in principle between associations for religious purposes and associations for purely secular purposes. All such voluntary associations being thus treated alike, as to their fundamental purpose, they should also be treated on the same principles by the State in the matter of taxation. If it can be shown that such is the case, that religious corporations receive from the State no favors not granted to other corporations for similar reasons, it will follow that there is no moral or legal objection to the exemption from taxation of church property.

The first right of any people is to secure their own well being. Any measures necessary to secure this, so they do not violate fundamental moral law, are justifiable. It is in pursuance of this principle that governments are organized for the protection of life and property, and the laying of taxes for the support of Government must follow this general principle. The working out of this general law of taxation by Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* has received little addition from subsequent economists. Of his four maxims, or principles, with which nearly all subsequent writers concur, the first is the most important : "The subjects of every State ought to contribute to the support of the Government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities—that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the State. In the observation or neglect of this maxim consists what is called the equality or inequality of taxation." The late Professor Fawcett preferred to state the principle thus : "The aggregate amount which each individual pays in taxes ought to be in proportion to his ability to contribute to the revenue of the State." This statement differs from that of Smith, only in providing more carefully that legislators in levying taxes should be more cautious than they sometimes are not to have the incidence of taxation fall with more weight upon a single class than upon other classes in the community. But the general principle is accepted by all authorities, that the burdens of Government should be imposed, so far as may be, equally upon all, heavily upon none. It follows, therefore, that not all persons, and not all kinds of property can be equitably taxed alike, since all do not enjoy an equal revenue, and so are not equally able to contribute to the expenses of the State.

This fundamental law of taxation is sometimes disputed by certain writers who hold that Government exists mainly, if not solely, for protection of life and property ; that taxation is the price paid for protection, and that all therefore ought to be taxed alike, in proportion to the protection received. It is evident that this theory is absurd. If it were true, then women and children ought to be taxed more heavily than adult men, since they need and receive a greater measure of protection from the State. According to this theory, insane persons, and those of feeble mind, should be the most heavily taxed class in the community. Moreover, as life no less than property is protected, according to this theory of taxation a poll-tax should be levied upon every member of the community, infants included, for the protection received. Truly these be fine conclusions, and we may follow the example of Fawcett in dismissing the theory which requires them "as scarcely worthy of serious consideration."

From the general principle that taxation is to be graduated according to ability to pay, may be deduced the principles according to which property may be exempted from taxation. The right of exemption, like the right of taxing, rests upon the one basis of the common weal of the people. It can rest on no other basis. Following out this general law, economists have laid down some general principles of exemption, substantially as follows :

First. The State need tax only so much property as is necessary to raise the amount of revenue needed for governmental expenses. As a matter of fact, no government taxes all property. The most ardent admirer of our American tariff probably never contended that Congress ought to lay a uniform tax of, say, twenty-five per cent *ad valorem*, on every article imported into the United States. There always has been, and always will be, a large free list, which will fluctuate from time to time according to the view of the majority that happens to prevail in Congress, without at all losing its essential character. In the State of New York there is at present a very active agitation, though confined to a body just now numerically small, in favor of reducing all State taxes to a single tax upon land. Men advocate this on the ground that such a tax is more easily levied and collected than any other ; and maintain that what is known among economists as the incidence or repercussion of taxation will in the end secure the placing of this burden equally upon all. As a matter of fact, therefore, as well as of principle, the State does, and must, exempt much property from taxation, and might exempt much more without violating any right.

Secondly. The State may, and should, exempt property from taxation when a tax would overburden it. A tax that is overburdensome is contrary to the fundamental principle of contribution according to the ability to pay ; hence, all essentially unproductive property may properly be exempted from taxation on the ground that to tax it would be overburdensome. In the long run the State would injure, not benefit, itself by a tax on such property. It would lay the burden of government, not upon those best able, but upon those least able, to bear it. It does not follow, however, that because essentially unproductive property may be exempted from taxation, no unproductive property should be taxed—far from it. Men or corporations, who hold property for their personal advantage. may fairly be presumed to reap profit from it—if not an actual, then a prospective profit. The contrary may, by some misfortune, be the fact, for, of course, it is not every business transaction that yields the expected profit. The State is right, however, in assuming that all property is potentially productive, and in proceeding to tax it on this presumption, unless the contrary distinctly appears to be the case. In a few instances, injustice will doubtless be done, but no general laws can be devised that would be absolutely just in their operation. The principle is sound, even if its practical effect is here and there oppressive. But the case is quite otherwise when men or corporations are found to hold property for other purposes than revenue—purposes that absolutely preclude the possibility of pecuniary profit to its owners; purposes that render it essentially unproductive; then the State may, and should, exempt it from taxation. If, for example, men of wealth in New York desire to establish a hospital for the free treatment of all classes, or to found an asylum for the insane or the blind or the aged, and if they should lavish their wealth upon the purchase of suitable grounds, and the erection of handsome buildings, is it for the interest of the whole people that they should be taxed for the privilege of thus gratifying their benevolent impulses? No, answers common sense. No, answers every economist. No, answers every civilized government under heaven. No, answers every right Christian impulse. Yes, answer a few enthusiasts, all property should be taxed.

Thirdly. The State may exempt from taxation any class of property when such exemption would encourage enterprises profitable to the State, and not likely otherwise to be undertaken, or, if undertaken, to prove successful. This may seem, at first blush, inconsistent with the principle of equality in taxation, but the seeming conflict is a conflict only in seeming. The justification of a tax, we have seen, consists solely in its tendency to promote the common weal; but it not infrequently happens that the welfare of all is best subserved by the exemption from taxation of certain classes of property, that are more or less exclusively devoted to the promotion of the good of all citizens. The sole question to be answered, in any given case where a claim is made for exemption, is, whether the enterprise in question is directly or indirectly beneficial to the people at large. If it is beneficial only to a part of the people, exemption would amount, in fact, to the taxing of one class for the benefit of another, which is admittedly indefensible.

Fourthly. The State may, and in fact does, exempt from taxation all property held for the public use and advantage. Public parks, buildings, highways, etc., are exempt under this principle. It would be absurd for the people to tax themselves for the privilege of having those things necessary to the convenience of all. The very existence of these things is in itself a tax. Every highway and park is just so much land thrown out of cultivation. Every building is erected with money taken from the people's pockets. To tax a tax would be an absurdity that could be seriously entertained only in Bedlam.

The question narrows itself, therefore, to the application of these general principles of exemption to the specific case of church property. Some have held that the exemption of church property can be justified under the first principle. They urge that the State can raise a revenue for its support without taxing such property, and therefore may properly exempt it. This contention, though plausible, will not bear examination, for the same argument might be urged in favor of exempting all other classes of property *seriatim*, and the strictly logical but highly absurd conclusion therefore would be that no property at all should be taxed. But the State must tax some property, and if church property is to plead exemption, it must show adequate cause.

A better case, however, is made for the exemption of church property under the second principle—that is to say, that a tax laid upon this species of property would overburden it. This does not necessarily imply that it would destroy churches, although doubtless in cases not a few the additional burden of a tax would make all the difference between life and death. It does not even mean that the tax would cripple the churches, though it doubtless would cripple many. What it means is that by such a tax a greatly disproportionate burden would be laid on church property, which would, *ipso facto*, as compared with other property, be *over* burdened. Church property is essentially unproductive—unproductive, that is to say, in the economic sense. It is unproductive in just the same manner as hospitals and asylums are unproductive, and therefore, like them, it may and should be exempt from taxation.

It is sometimes objected to this conclusion that, although religious proprietors do not derive a pecuniary revenue from their property, they receive a moral revenue that is quite as valuable, and hence that their property cannot be called unproductive. This is evidently mere word-jugglery. Tax and revenue are economic terms. Political economy takes cognizance only of values that can be expressed in dollars and cents. Financiers have never devised a scheme for taxing the pleasure that a man derives from the ownership of a fine picture or statue, the mental sharpening that he gains from a good book, or the moral impulse that comes from the hearing of a good sermon. To tax things like these would be like the project once so popular in Laputa, to extract sunbeams from cucumbers. Like other ingenious devices of which Gulliver brought report from that remarkable country, it would be hardly practicable among us.

Church property may be exempted from taxation under the third principle recognized by economists, because the existence and prosperity of religious societies are profitable to the State. By religious societies is not meant Christian bodies alone, but all religious bodies. Gibbon tells us that there was a time in the later history of Rome when all religions were looked upon by the people as equally true, by the philosophers as equally false, and by the emperors as equally expedient. To some extent the modern State agrees with the Roman emperor. With few exceptions, all religious bodies teach a sound practical morality. It is well known that the moral maxims of Mohammed, of Buddha, and of Confucius are substantially identical with the decalogue. Any religion, from the statesman's point of view, is better than no religion, because religion of whatever kind adds to morality incentives and sanctions, and tends to secure right conduct. The proposition is not to be doubted that the existence of any religious society is beneficial to the State, by the mere fact that its teachings enforce morality and restrain vice, crime, and pauperism. This is true more especially of Christianity, which, whether it is believed or rejected as a dogmatic system, is admitted to teach the purest system of morals that mankind has known.

Every economist and publicist will tell us that the chief burden of government arises from the necessity of preventing, detecting, and punishing crime. If the sphere of government could be confined to the one aim of promoting the general welfare of the people, by undertaking such enterprises as individual or corporate effort could not carry out, the cost of administration would be a *bagatelle* compared with what it now is. To maintain courts, to pay police, to build, equip and support prisons, constitutes the heaviest part of the burden of government. If to this be added the cost of pauperism to the community, we have probably seventy-five per cent of our present expenses accounted for, the stealings of dishonest officials being always excepted. Take away crime and pauperism and the expenses of government would not be more than one-fourth of their present amount. Now every religious society, by whatsoever name it is known, might be called "A Society for the Prevention of Crime and Pauperism." It is obviously for the interests of the State, the organized body of the people, by every means in its power to encourage the formation of such societies. It would be to frustrate the objects of government, if the State were to lay a heavy burden on enterprises so profitable, so indispensable, to it. It is often admitted, in fact, by those more or less hostile to the churches, that this line of argument would hold good if the Christian churches were actually what they are in theory. It is maintained, however, that the average church, at least of Protestant denominations, is a social club; that church buildings are religious club-houses, fitted up and supported for the social and spiritual delectation of their owners; and that the public in general are not only not desired to partake of these advantages, but are in practice rigorously excluded. There are, perhaps, a few ultra-fashionable churches of which this may be said with some approach to truth. It is a caricature, however, of the average Christian church, which maintains a costly property, often by dint of great self-sacrifice, and asks nothing better than that the general public will share the use of it.

It is urged that the taxation of church property would tend to repress extravagance in building magnificent temples, and check the desire for show, which is doing so much to alienate the masses from Christianity. This extravagance has the result, we are assured, of making churches select institutions, attendance at which is accompanied by so many expenses as to be beyond the means of ordinary people. Men would be slow, it is added, to invest a half million dollars in a splendid church, if they knew that so doing would involve them in a heavy annual taxation. It is admitted on all hands that the extirpation of religious pride were a consummation devoutly to be wished. It may be a question, however, whether it is not too deeply rooted in our sinful human nature to be eradicated by any short and easy method like this. The fact that a church is able to build a magnificent edifice usually warrants the conclusion that it would be able to pay taxes on it also if necessary. A church of millionaires would have just as imposing an edifice, just as lofty a steeple, just as elaborate carving and decorations, if taxed, as if untaxed. It would be the poor church, already staggering under its financial burdens, that would be seriously affected by taxation. Besides, this argument is two-edged. Do not those who urge it comprehend that taxation would only increase the expenses of churches, make attendance more difficult than ever, and so widen the breach between the masses and Christianity the existence of which they so deeply (and no doubt so sincerely) lament? It is to be considered, moreover, that the richer churches, which now give largely to benevolent objects, and establish missions at home and abroad, would inevitably be compelled to diminish both the scope and the amount of their contributions. We are most vehemently assured that taxation will prove a blessing in disguise to the churches, but it would be so thoroughly disguised that few eyes would be sharp enough to discover the blessing. For the State, it would certainly be a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy.

Under the fourth principle, also, church property may be exempted from taxation, on the ground that it is held for the public use and advantage. If it is objected that this cannot be the case, because the title to it is held by corporations and that it thus becomes private property, it may be replied that cemeteries, libraries, museums, hospitals, and many other similar institutions are also controlled by corporations, but are generally regarded as public property, notwithstanding. Every building maintained by religious societies is maintained, not for its own use merely, but for the public use. To use these buildings is, in fact, a thing that they are always trying, by every device that occurs to them, to persuade the public to do. They not infrequently are criticised for adopting undignified and unworthy expedients to attract the crowd. The press, which is so careful a censor of the churches and their doings, is continually lashing ministers for preaching sensational and secularized discourses to catch the attention of the fickle multitude.

The conclusion follows, therefore, that to tax church property would not secure the common welfare of the people, but would tend to defeat the purpose of government. To tax it would be to deny that the State may render the same favors to religious as to secular organizations. To tax it would be, not to put all corporations on an equal footing, but to put one class of corporations at a decided disadvantage. To tax it would be to legislate against religion, not to leave it free and untrammelled. Those who oppose the exemption of church property on the ground that it is an unfair favoring of religion, advocate a policy of oppressing religion. They strain out the gnat while they swallow the camel.

We have thus far barely glanced at the chief objection made to exemption by such as are correctly represented in the action of the Canadian Baptists—namely, that to exempt church property from taxation is the same thing in principle as direct State aid to the Church. We have approached this position negatively, from the side of economics. It is time to look at it face to face. Is there no difference in principle, as we are so emphatically told, between giving a sum of money yearly out of the treasury to a church or sectarian institution of any sort, and releasing the said church or institution from the payment of a like sum yearly into the treasury? This distinction would seem to be clear, at least, that while grants from the treasury are direct aid, exemption is at most indirect aid. Government may give indirect aid to institutions and enterprises to which it can give no direct aid. Thus, it would not be constitutional to lay taxes on the people for the sake of paying subsidies to manufacturers, but it is constitutional so to lay taxes as to afford incidental protection to American industries. We may differ as to the economic expediency of a protective tariff, but we can surely see a very real distinction, both in law and in morals, between a tariff and a subsidy. But on what ground is exemption pronounced even indirect aid? If the State refrains from taxing me for owning and using a watch, does it thereby do the same thing as if it paid me money out of the treasury? Let us recall the definition of a tax—an assessment of the people, made by themselves, for defraying the expenses of government. Now if the people decide, in order to raise the necessary sum, that justice will be secured by taxing a certain class of property, well and good. But if they decide just the contrary, equally well and good. In the first case they have oppressed no one ; in the second, they have rendered aid to no one. It is nonsense to maintain that whenever the State refrains from taxing property it thereby in principle gives direct aid to the untaxed. On that theory we are all of us the beneficiaries of the State to a large amount.

But, it is urged, if church property is not taxed, the result will be that other property will necessarily be taxed more heavily. Whatever force this objection might have if we kept our eyes fixed on the abstract question of taxation, and excluded all other facts, it immediately falls to the ground when we take an all-around view of the case. Who does not know that the presence of a church in a locality increases the value of all the surrounding property ? So fully is this fact appreciated, that speculators in real estate willingly give lots for the building of a church, in the full persuasion that they will reimburse themselves by the sale of the remaining lots at higher prices. Add to this the increased value of all property in a community, by reason of the restraint exercised on crime and pauperism by a church, and it is clear that other property owners have received a *quid pro quo* for every dollar of taxation that they pay on account of the exemption of church property. No injustice is done to anybody by this arrangement, but, on the contrary, substantial justice is done all around ; for, if the church were to be taxed, it would be the one property owner in the community that would be deprived of the fruits of its own influence. As the immortal Sam Weller once remarked, " If my eyes wos a pair o' patent double magnifyin' gas microscopes of hextra power, p'raps I might be able to see" the injustice that is done to the average taxpayer by exemption of church property, " but bein' only eyes, you see, my wision's limited." By increasing the amount of taxable value, churches decrease the tax levied on each individual ; and by decreasing the chief expense of government they lessen the sum to be raised. In both ways the taxpayer profits, and it would be very small of him to protest against a state of things that is so much to his advantage. He does not. The protests come, not from the taxpayers and owners of property, but from fanatics and visionaries, who have little or no pecuniary stake in the matter. They are to be acquitted of the meanness of striving to injure the institution that is their benefactor. They are guilty of nothing worse than inconsiderate following of a theory to practically absurd conclusions.

Perhaps the objection urged against exemption that is least worthy of a respectful hearing is that it unduly favors the Roman Catholic Church. It would be more honest if this were put in the forefront by most of those who advocate the taxation of church property. They would then be doing in a straightforward way what they now are doing under false pretences—making their campaign on the basis of religious prejudice, and not on the basis of reason or economics. All the fine talk about religious liberty and total separation between Church and State, when it is closely analyzed comes to nothing more or less than hatred of Romanism and jealousy of its increasing wealth and power. Taxation is thought to be a weapon that will deal effective blows, and taxation accordingly is vehemently urged. For the sake of appearances, it is sought to give the agitation a legal and moral basis ; but let the discussion go on long enough, and the animus against Romanism is certain to appear.

This is particularly true in Canada at the present time, where the zeal for complete religious liberty is hottest—if we believe the protestations of the zealots. In the Province of Quebec, we are told, the Romanists hold property valued at from $100,000,000 to $120,000,000, all of which is free of taxation. It includes not merely churches, but residences of priests and bishops, convents, seminaries, hospitals, and other real estate. The revenue of this property is estimated at not less than $10,000,000, though this must be a large over-estimate, unless such property is vastly more productive in Canada than here, which may well be doubted. It is not alleged that this revenue is used for any other purposes than religious—the support of the worship of God according to the Roman Catholic faith and the maintenance of the schools and charities for which that church is honorably famous. When, therefore, our Canadian friends denounce the Roman Church as a money-making corporation, which ought to be taxed like other corporations that do business for gain, they evidently strain the truth quite as much as it will bear. The Roman Church is not like ordinary corporations, and no amount of assertion will make it like them. Stubborn facts are not to be changed by rhetoric. Charity and religion differ from business, and an organization that devotes all its revenues to these ends cannot be justly classed with organizations that exist with the avowed purpose of making money for the personal gain of their members.

Any American, however, will readily admit that the principle of exemption has been pushed too far in Quebec. In the United States exemption is not given to all sorts of property owned by ecclesiastical bodies. The residences of the clergy are either not excepted from taxation at all, or excepted only to a limited amount. School property, even when owned and managed by a church, is not untaxed in most of the States. Other real estate than that used strictly for purposes of worship is subject to taxation if owned by a church, just as if it were owned by any citizen. The great corporation of Trinity Church, in New York City, is a good illustration of the American method. Trinity Church itself is not taxed, nor are certain chapels maintained by the corporation for religious worship. The bulk of the Trinity property, real estate in the very heart of New York, valued at many million dollars, pays taxes. This is just, for that property is leased for business purposes, and being managed with great skill by an able vestry, brings into the treasury of the corporation a great revenue. That revenue is used, almost to the last dollar, for religious and charitable work that is of vast benefit to the city ; but even that fact is not allowed to exempt revenue-paying property from bearing its due burden of tax. A better example of the equitable application of the principles of taxation and exemption could not easily be found. Canada cannot do better than imitate on a large scale what is done in the case of this single parish. That done, the Protestants of Quebec will have no grievance against the exemptions granted to Romanists.

But this antipathy to Romanists, of which all enlightened Protestants ought to be heartily ashamed, as of any other relic of the Dark Ages, if it succeeds in obtaining the gratification that it seeks, will infallibly do Protestants more harm than Romanists. At least, this is true of the United States, and is probably true of every part of Canada except the single Province of Quebec. In the aggregate, the real estate held by Protestant bodies vastly exceeds in value that held by Romanists. This is true even of the great cities, where the Romanists have massed themselves, and where for generations a policy of accumulating property has been followed under shrewd leaders. Much more is it true of the country at large. Out of our sixty million people, not more than eight millions, taking their own highest estimate, are Romanists. It is highly probable that about the same ratio of property as of membership exists. An estimate made about a dozen years ago valued the church property of Romanists in the United States at $61,000,000, and that of Protestants at $294,000,000. These figures have doubtless greatly advanced since that time, but there is no reason to suppose any material alteration in the ratio. If anything like this ratio still obtains, a general system of taxation applied to church property would impose burdens on Protestants five times as great as Romanists would be called upon to bear. How short-sighted the policy proposed ! We have all heard of the man who cut off his nose to spite his face, but in truth he was a very Solomon compared with those who would have all church property taxed in order to burden the Romanists. As Talleyrand said, or is credited with having said, such a policy would be worse than a crime —it would be a blunder.

BROTHERHOODS.

BY WILLIAM BOYD CARPENTER, BISHOP OF RIPON.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), Jan., 1890.

New proposals are strange revealers of human character. The proposal for the establishment of Brotherhoods is no exception. Those who have watched the discussion must have been amused, if they were not edified, by the variety of the comments which the proposal evoked. The philanthropic mind most probably was distressed to find that the merits of the proposal were obscured by the acrimony which was displayed. Extremists are never right, though they are always zealous. It may be questioned, indeed, whether a certain narrowness of understanding is not indispensable for a certain class of success. The fact that a theological turn could be given to the discussion made it possible that the proposal would not be discussed on its merits. Voltaire, speaking of Dante, said, "Il a des commentateurs : c'est peut-être encore une raison de plus pour n'être compris." The same complaint may be made respecting the present proposal. The comments have obscured the text, and the zeal of party has, as was to be expected, darkened counsel with words without knowledge and without charity.

This may sound severe language, but I think that it might be justified by a series of elegant extracts selected from letters contributed to the controversy. But no good would be done by printing words which are better forgotten. There would be no necessity even to refer to them, except for the purpose of warning ourselves that the *entête* spirit of the zealot should be severely repressed, lest, while we wrangle, the more important aspects of the question should be forgotten, and the opportunity of good be lost.

At the outset it ought, in justice to those who made the proposal, to be remembered that it arises out of a great and confessed need. Archbishop Tait has told us "that there were districts into which it was not right to ask a clergyman to take his wife, in which to bring up his children; but if men could live together for a certain number of years, there would not only be a saving of expense, but they would afford each other the mutual help and sympathy they so much needed."* The Church, it has been declared times without number, cannot overtake the work which the rapid accumulation of town populations has thrown upon her. "How are we to reach the masses" has been a kind of commonplace of Church Congresses. The density of the population, the celerity with which towns have expanded, the strange and abnormal conditions of life which this state of things has caused, have thrown upon the Church work and duties which have strained the machinery, and for which it is declared the existing plant is wholly inadequate. This state of things is perplexing, and, from the rapidity with which it has come about, it is bewildering also. The multitudes gathered in our great towns are beheld by some with alarm, by others with compassion, and with a deep and perplexed sense of responsibility. Practical heathenism, lowered morals, enfeebled vitality, dull, spiritless, pleasureless existence are mentioned among the results. The plans which the philanthropist suggests are too often rank heresies in the eyes of the political economist, while it must be confessed that the political economist has little to offer in their place. Doubtless there are remedies which may, in process of time, heal this miserable condition of things; it may be true that there are great unseen forces in operation which will slowly readjust the unwholesome distribution of population. But forces like these will work but slowly, and Christian sympathy cannot bear to stand still and watch the growth of misery and sin without some effort to console and purify, if not to relieve. This spirit finds expression in the Church, who, like her Lord, must feel compassion for the multitudes. She feels that while we are deliberating on the best means of dealing with the problem, there are thousands who are practically perishing. Something for such present and crying needs is imperative. Such is the situation, and such are the feelings which have given rise to the proposal of establishing Brotherhoods in the Church of England.

If such needs exist, and new methods are demanded, any proposal emanating from experienced men is entitled to sympathetic attention. The present proposal may be wise or unwise, it may be possible or it may be utterly impracticable, but to cry it down unheard or to push it forward unconsidered, to use it as a stalking-horse for attacking unpopular doctrines or for advertising obsolete and retrogressive opinion, is to betray an ill-regulated mind. Certainly it is unworthy of a great and respectable party in the Church to prejudice its discussion by a picture, or to cry it down with a phrase; and it is no less undignified on the part of others to find in the discussion an opportunity of discrediting men whose very jealousy of innovation is evidence of their attachment to the Church in which they have labored.

All this is unfortunate, and it is illogical. It is never wise to speak before we know; it is always foolish to criticise what has not been proposed. Critics, in this case, might have remembered that it was just possible that those who were responsible for the suggestion did know a little history, and were not wholly ignorant of the dangers resulting from this or kindred proposals. At the same time it must be admitted that the proposal has been put forth in some quarters with phrases which could not fail to arouse suspicion. The Bishop of Durham, in his observations on the proposal, deprecated this flaunting of a red rag in a matter which needs above all things calm and judicial consideration.

It may allay some of the not unnaturally aroused suspicion to recall certain facts. It is a mistake, for instance, to suppose that community-life is the exclusive practice of any one portion of Christendom. Religious bodies, which cannot be suspected of Ultramontane leanings, possess institutions of the kind. There are religious communities at Kaiserwerth and Strasbourg which are in connection with the Lutheran Church. There are similar institutions at Paris and Echellins which are connected respectively with the French and Swiss Reformed Churches. It is, further, a mistake to suppose that institutions like the Religious Houses or Brotherhoods were favoured only by one party in the Church of England. Among those who lifted up his voice for their continuance was the stout-hearted reformer, Latimer. Organizations of young men, devout and devoted to good works, in the seventeenth century, were recognized with approval by Bishop Beveridge as well as by Bishop Ken, by Stillingfleet as well as Tenison.

---

* "Systematic Lay Agency," *National Review*, No. 70, p. 515.

But while unreasoning alarm is to be deprecated, the risks ought to be considered. If it needs to be constantly remembered that there is nothing which is necessarily Roman in the idea of Brotherhoods, it is no less necessary to observe the cautions and warnings which the history of such institutions reveals. We are neither to be deterred from making an experiment by the cry that it is Roman, nor are we to be blinded to the risks which we encounter by the eagerness of those who only welcome the proposal for the very reason which in others awakens alarm. There are dangers; and the evidence which is the most striking is that which comes from the Latin Church itself. It would be simple madness to ignore the lessons of the past. In the twelfth century, Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux, requested Pope Alexander VIII. to dissolve the monastery of Grestain, on the ground that it was past reformation. At the close of the fourteenth century Nicolas de Clamenges charged the monasteries with being scenes of waste, idleness, and drunkenness. The Councils of Constance and Basel approved the statements of Bridget of Sweden, when she depicted the dark and low condition of the religious houses. In the sixteenth century a Committee of Cardinals (Reginald Pole was one of the number) expressed their opinion that the religious houses ought to be abolished. In the eighteenth century Scipio de Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, excommunicated the Dominican friars, and forbade their officiating in his diocese. But perhaps the most remarkable illustration of all is one derived from our own days:—

"The total number of monasteries, &c., suppressed in Italy down to the close of 1882 was 2255, involving an enormous displacement of property and dispersion of inmates. And yet there is some reason to think that the State did but do roughly and harshly what the Church should have done more gradually and wisely; for the judgment passed on the dissolution by Pius IX. himself, in speaking to an English Roman Catholic bishop, was: 'It was the devil's work; but the good God will turn it into a blessing, since their destruction was the only reform possible to them.'" *

It will be understood that I am not alluding to these for any controversial purpose. The lessons which such facts suggest are the common heritage of all Christian bodies; they shed light on the laws and conditions of human nature. It is interesting in this connection to recall a parallel from Oriental experience. In the East, as in the West, the risk arising from a disregard of simple principles is illustrated. The organization of the cloister was a powerful aid in the advancement of Buddhism, but only so long as the spirit of missionary zeal existed. When that ceased, monasticism became a hindrance instead of a help. In proportion as the "tendency to expansion of the Buddhist Church grew fainter, monasticism became a barrier in the way of every sound development, and thus the cause of utter stagnation."

Thus the forgetfulness of the conditions of life avenges itself sooner or later. There is a Quixotic disregard of laws which is sometimes called zeal. A man may run full tilt against a windmill with impunity, but the probability is that he will get the worst of the encounter. One man, or one group of men, may achieve what would be hopeless for others to attempt. The rule observed by one may be disastrous to the thousands, who, under the influence of some passing excitement or eager emotion, take upon themselves a burden which experience may show was too grievous for them to bear. Lifelong vows appear to me to be of this nature, when the vow involves that which is not necessary for righteousness' sake. The Convocation of Canterbury has realized this danger, and has pronounced against a system of lifelong vows. There is wisdom in this decision. To make a lifelong vow, in a matter which is neither within the survey of experience nor in the statute book of universal righteousness, is (if I may use an old-fashioned phrase belonging to an age of greater faith and less fussiness than the present) to tempt Providence. We may be asked if there is not such a thing as a call to celibacy. I have no doubt of it. Our Lord's words are sufficient for me on the matter; but he who is so called needs no vow: the call will be evidenced in the fact of his life. And it is to be remembered that a man may be called to be a father of saints who does not know of his calling till he is far advanced in life. To make a vow which anticipates or prevents the calling of Providence savours of little faith, not of large faith, and has in it a flavour of self-will rather than that spirit which waits on the will of Him who, though He orders the

---

* See Article on Monasteries in "Encyclopædia Britannica."

whole life, yet veils from us His leadings from period to period.

To put the same thought from another standpoint, it is an unquestioned law of man's development that his powers, capacities, and necessities do not ripen in every man alike, in the same fashion, or at the same time. There are men who are boys in some of their qualities and powers till they have passed two-score years. Such do not waken to the consciousness of power or the possession of their complete manhood till they have reached, perhaps, the middle arch of life. To bind a man with a lifelong vow on matters which are hardly yet within the range of his own self-consciousness appears to me to be an act of at least doubtful wisdom.

But here it is urged that these exceptional cases may be met by exceptional means—the vows may be made dispensable by proper authority. Against this I entertain the very strongest objection. To do this is to weaken the sense of the sanctity of a vow, by dangling before the eyes of him who makes it the possibility that what is said to be lifelong need not be so in reality. To do this is to throw upon another a responsibility which, in the nature of the case, he cannot bear. To do this is to trifle with the most sacred thing on earth—the sanctity of a man's own conscience.

Might we not say that the very suggestion of dispensable vows bears strong witness against the proposal to make vows lifelong? The same difficulty does not exist when a time-limit is introduced into the agreement, so long as the limit is not a very distant one. If a society is to have sustained and continuous life in its work, those who join it ought to give a definite length of service. This seems both wise and needful. There ought to be no objection and no difficulty in the introduction of common-sense and business-like agreements as to the length of service. There are thousands who sign agreements to serve in particular places at special work for a specified period. An agreement of this sort, by whatever name it is called, ought not to rouse suspicion or jealousy. If the work is religious, the promise might well be made during some religious service. In any case, the promise to do religious work might surely be viewed as a promise to be religiously kept, and as having an obligation at any rate as binding as that which binds men in the military and civil service. It is unfortunately too much the custom to regard a promise in matters of religion as something which is only binding as long as it is convenient. Opposed as I am to lifelong vows, and disposed to regard vows of all kinds as indicating not a higher, but a lower, stage of religious life, I should be thankful to see a sterner sense of the nature of the obligations of religious service, and a sturdier determination to discharge such obligations, come fair, come foul, at home and abroad.

But this leads to another lesson which the history of religious movements most surely teaches, and which our own experience must, I think, confirm. We are in danger, nevertheless, of forgetting it. The value of organization, in one sense, cannot be exaggerated, and it has been argued that the power of such institutions depends on their being recognized as part of the organization of the Church. This has been urged recently. "These institutions flourished as long as their discipline was maintained; they drooped because they depended on individual exertion and piety." So writes Mr. T. Gambier Parry. What was wanted, says Mr Huntingdon, was recognition and authority.*

There is doubtless truth in this view; but the other side must not be forgotten. Organization is not everything. Alone it is entirely valueless. We touch here a question which lies at the root of many problems. It has constantly been misunderstood; and misunderstanding is perilous. We organize free institutions, and we are disappointed to find that happiness is not secured to mankind by their existence. We organize Church work; and we are pained to find that organization does not always mean effectiveness. Pain and disappointment might have been avoided if we had been more ready to learn the lesson of history. Organization may afford great scope to life, and richer results to energy; but organization will not produce saints, nor the establishing of Brotherhoods create piety. Law made nothing perfect; rules cannot make evangelists. The order and the rule come after saintship, and rarely, if ever, do they precede it. The heavenly flame rests on some human soul. It burns within him, and with the Prophet he feels the fire of God; he yearns to work some deliverance upon the doubts. Like the Apostle, a noble necessity is laid upon him; the worst woe which can befall him is disobedience to a necessity which, like all the higher passions of life, is often a torment and a delight. While such a man lives, the life which he has chosen is noble and real. The same is true of all those in whom a kindred spirit lives. The spirit finds its own organization. The rules which are laid down are the expression of the life which is in them and of the spirit into which they have been baptized. Their zeal, like a river, makes its own banks by following the course of its own nature. But even in the most favoured conditions the gentler life which gathers round the holy spires is not all that hope painted it—

---

* *National Review*, No. 70, p. 597.

> "The potent call
> Doubtless shall cheat full oft the heart's desires."

The favourable conditions, moreover, cannot last always. The generation will arise which retains the form, but which has lost the animating spirit. There comes a time when the noble river runs dry; deadness and dryness take the place of freshness and murmuring life. Then, because the spirit which gave vital force to the movement is no longer there, the rules lose their force and value; the commandment becomes the means of death; the organization sinks beneath its own weight. When Saul is gone it will not do for David to wear his armour; when Achilles has passed away lesser men may but wound their hands and snap their muscles in striving to bend his bow. The spirit may inspire rules. Rules cannot restore the spirit. When we have the men we shall have the organization; but it is ill hoping that by adopting an organization we shall be in possession of the power to work them. Above all, let us avoid the belief that we can ever be great or achieve great things by imitation. Those who play the frog woo disaster. If the spirit which is in our midst be a true spirit, it must adapt its organization to the needs of our own age. It will draw useful hints from the past, but it will avoid all slavish and mechanical imitation of it. By virtue of its own real life, it will quicken, arouse, and direct all kindred zeal. Wherever a man in whom the true spirit dwells arises to work among the sons of men, brothers like-minded will gather round his standard, and the work of such men can never be in vain.

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY MYSTIC.

BY EDWARD DOWDEN.

From *The Fortnightly Review* (London), Jan., 1890.

A CURIOUS document in the history of eighteenth-century religious life lies before me—a manuscript written by a careful hand on rough paper in ink now somewhat faded by the passage of the years. It is an English version of the manuscript autobiography of a Protestant pietiest, born in France, but a resident in Germany—Charles Hector, Marquis St. George de Marsay. A transcript of the original by a friend of the author is preserved, I believe, in the Provenzial-Kirchenarchiv at Coblenz. A portion of a text, in all essentials identical with that of Coblenz, was printed in De Valenti's *System der höhern Heilkunde,* 1826; but I am not aware that any account has been given to English readers of De Marsay's strange history, except a brief sketch which forms part of a note in the second volume of Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics.* The young writer of that interesting, but slender study of a great subject tells us that he had been lent by Mr. Tindal Harris a manuscript copy of the English *Life of De Marsay.* Whether the copy used by him was the identical volume now in my possession I am unable to say. More than one copy may have been made of a book supposed to tend to edification. Certain works, even in comparatively recent times, have enjoyed a life of considerable, though circumscribed, activity in the ambush of manuscript circulation. So it was in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, with the *Vie de Spinoza* attributed to the physician Lucas. De Marsay was no heresiarch like Spinoza, but his confessions are of so intimate a nature that disciples may have felt that they were hardly suited for the crowd of ordinary readers. As they come to us now they have more than a private and personal interest; they furnish materials for the study of the psychology of a people and a period.

German pietism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a great affair in the life of the nation. It was an escape from the tyranny of dogma that had stiffened into mere intellectual tradition. It was a restoration of moral life after the wreck and ruin wrought by the Thirty Years' War. It was, at a later date, a recoil of the emotions from the rationalism of the deists. Pietism satisfied after a fashion a real need of the time, a need felt not in Germany alone, but throughout every country of Europe. Molinos in Spain, Fénélon, Madame Guyon, and Antoinette Bourignon in France, Spener and Francke and Zinzendorf in Germany, William Law and John Byrom in England, differing, as they did, in many respects, were agreed in demanding for the soul a warmer emotional life than that approved by the religious orthodoxy of their day. We perceive from the "Confessions of a Beautiful Soul" in Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* that the influence of the pietistic movement was not exhausted in the second half of the eighteenth century. But its sources had been to a great extent diverted to feed the literary movement of the time. Freytag has justly observed that the sentimentality of the Werther period was the stepdaughter of the emotional excitement of the elder pietism. In each there is a like habit of self-observation and endless self-confession, in each a like tender sensibility of spirit. And indeed the extravagances, irregularities, and licentiousness of the sentimental period can be paralleled, and more than paralleled, by the sensual orgies of perverted pietism, when, in its ambition to transcend the limitations of the flesh, it overleaped itself and fell on the other side.

Charles Hector de Marsay was born in Paris in the year 1688. His parents at the time of the persecution of the Reformed Church had left their estate near La Rochelle, and hidden themselves in the capital. The infant was baptized "in a Roman Church." It would seem that the family had fled soon after this from France to Germany. We know little of De Marsay's boyhood except that he was carefully educated in the reformed faith of his mother, and that he was attracted by the Scriptures and the books of devotion—writings of Jurieu and La Placette—which she had placed in his hands, exhorting him to read them three times a day. At an early age he became an ensign in the British-Hanoverian Regiment, which fought under Marlborough during the war of the Spanish Succession. Amid the distractions of the camp he strove hard to give himself up to contemplation and prayer, but being "entirely ignorant in the Inner Ways" he found that it put a severe and constant strain upon him to bring into some degree of harmony his duties as a soldier and his secret life of devotion.

> "When the feast of Easter approached I doubled my exercises of contemplation, prayer, and self examination in order to prepare myself worthily for the communion. I withdrew from all society of the officers, and spent the days, as far as my calling would permit, in a quiet retirement. God gave me at that time much grace, and such a zeal and taste of his love that I prayed three or four days without intermission, if not with the mouth yet always within myself; and although during this time our regiment was on a march and in a post where we were obliged to be under arms day and night, yet this troublesome circumstance did not hinder me to continue in prayer. It seemed to me I was already in Paradise, and was so simple as to believe this state would continue during life."

Such ecstatic happiness could not long endure, and with the trouble of mental distraction there came also bodily illness. Believing that death was near De Marsay lay sick for three months at Lille, and, though calm in mind, it now seemed to him that his past joys of the soul were nothing but baseless fancies. He might have learnt, as he tells us, from the *De Imitatione,* which was by his side, that the substance of true devotion does not reside in "felt sensibilities" and "sweetnesses," but in "love of the cross, self-denial, and the resigned will to receive all from the hand of God with equanimity, the sweetnesses as the bitternesses, the attention as the dissipation, the courtings of the divine bridegroom as his absence, the banishment of the heart as the love;" but he understood not what he read, and grasped with a spiritual greediness only at what might gratify his zeal. Failing in his desires after perpetual luxury of the soul, he had almost resolved to "let God enjoy his happiness in heaven, and to make himself merry on earth" in the common ways of the world, when a letter reached him from his comrade, Lieutenant Cordier, dated from the camp at Bethune, in which the writer assured him that the devotion they had hitherto practised was nothing, exhorted him to make acquaintance with the writings of Antoinette Bourignon, and informed him that he, Cordier, had resolved for his own part to quit the military service, to forsake the world, to withdraw to some desert, and there to lead a poor retired life. The letter added that the chaplain of the Hanoverian Regiment, M. Baratier, had taken the same resolution, and it closed with an invitation to De Marsay to join them in their retreat.

Bayle, in his Dictionary, having described Antoinette Bourignon's extreme uncomeliness of person, goes on in his mocking way to assert that she possessed not merely *immanent* but *transitive* chastity, the rare gift of "penetrative virginity," or infrigidation, which not only preserves its possessor's heart from temptation, but freezes up the passions of all persons who may approach her. The most virtuous of *religieuses,* he adds, have in general been content with the more common gift of immanent chastity. Eagerly De Marsay bought up the writings of this illuminated lady in whose birthplace—Lille—he happened to be, and as he recovered strength read them diligently, though not without some fear lest he might fall into heresy. When restored to health he rejoined his regiment, now engaged at the siege of St. Venant, but it became clear to him that he must follow the example of his companions, abandon the career of a soldier, and lead henceforth a poor evangelical life in retirement. A regard for honour kept him from seeking his discharge until the campaign was ended; he faced the dangers of the trenches and received no hurt, but it was a joy when at length in garrison at Brussels he could invite his soul and yield himself up to such writings as *The Obscure Night* of St. John of the Cross and the *Life* of St. Teresa. After considerable difficulty and delay the discharge from military service was obtained, and late in the autumn of 1711, at the age of twenty-three, De Marsay joined his two companions at Schwartzenau, where they had been permitted to settle on the property of the Countess of Wittgenstein, a devout lady who had already drawn into her neighbourhood many pious souls.

De Marsay shall himself record for us the doings and the trials of this period of his life. Let those persons who smile at the religious distress caused by his hearty craving for food remember that he is not singular in such sensibility of conscience. It was a light of the Oxford movement, Richard Hurrell Froude, who made the pathetic entries in his diary: "Looked with greediness to see if there was goose on the table for dinner;" "Meant to have kept a fast, and did abstain from dinner, but at tea eat buttered toast." There was something to warrant repentance, at least from an epicure's point of view, in De Marsay's choice of a cold potato as his criminal *bonne-bouche.*

> "We three then began our community as Eremits, and lived very retired and solitary. Our outward order which we observed was thus regulated: we rose at four in the morning, and laboured each in his work with great stillness, after we had heard some chapters of the Holy Scriptures read by one of us. M. Baratier took care of the economy of the kitchen. Mr. Cordier and I went from four in the morning till seven o'clock, this spring 1711 [-12], out in the field to work and till the ground, to sow some fruit that we might have our bread. At seven we returned home and eat our breakfast of dry bread which we had baked ourselves. From that time till noon everyone had his work. Mr. Cordier's work was to spin wool, and mine to card wool and knit. It was also his part to go on errands, when it was needful to fetch something for us, and it was my part to gather leaves of trees, instead of straw, to lie upon, and to cleanse the stable. At noon we dined. Baratier boiled for us all the seven days of the week the same food. During one week we had a dish of peas and nothing else, neither before nor after, except a piece of bread to eat with the peas; the following week we had barley; the next buckwheat groats; the next oatmeal pap, and so on by changes. After dinner somebody of us read some part out of A. Bourignon's writings, then everyone went to his work until four o'clock. Then Cordier and I went again into the field to work till seven o'clock which was the hour of supper. This consisted in a dish of pulse or salad, groats, turnips, yellow turnips, or something else as the season of the year did furnish. After supper we remained in our chamber at work till nine o'clock, when we retired to rest.
>
> "So we spent the day, and kept silence in our employments. Our exercise was to be in a constant recollection, to be turned inward and remain in the presence of God. We spoke or asked nothing but what was necessary. Our drink was clear water, and when it pleased M. Baratier to give us a special treat, he boiled groats in milk for us. I can say that this was so delicate food that I could not master my appetite in it as I would. I tried it and sometimes took wormwood to overcome my taste, but all in vain, and I had constantly to fight against my desire of eating what was a grievance to me. For I had so warm a desire for the hour of meals and longed so much for it, that it put me in a continual conflict and caused me much suffering. For I had a great appetite to eat, and yet dared not satisfy the same without fear and doubt. I would during the meal keep my thoughts to the presence of God, but was much interrupted in it by my desire of eating, which many a year has exercised me. Among other things I remember that once I eat a potato between meals, for which I was severely reproved in my conscience. I would excuse the matter within myself and not confess my fault to God, but I fell into inward darkness, which was so terrible that it seemed to me as if I was plunged into the deepest abyss. I went out into the wood, and sat comfortless down on the stump of a tree. It appeared to me as if God had rejected me, and would have nothing to do with me, having given me up to myself, which gave me a deep and inexpressible pain. But this did not last long, and when I confessed my fault it pleased his goodness soon to dissipate this dark cloud and to restore me to my former calmness of mind."

It will be noticed that in this record of a day's doings no regular hours are mentioned as being set apart for prayer. The members of the little community, says De Marsay, endeavoured, in accordance with Antoinette Bourignon's directions, to make all they did a prayer, by doing it in God's presence and to please and serve Him. He himself ceased from his laborious efforts at contemplation, and his prayer became a childlike babbling of the heart to the invisible Friend: "this was the reason that I read but little, and what Brother Lawrence of the Resurrection mentions of this exercise of the presence of God which he practised in his kitchen work and when he made dumplings, that was also my business that I performed all my poor work in His love and presence."

Suffering much, however, for a time from spiritual aridity, he thought it well to consult and beg for the prayers of a pious shoemaker at Schwartzenau, one Maximilian Daut, who had written a prophetical book of some repute. On his way home from this visit, De Marsay heard the words of Scripture pronounced in his inward senses: "Is there no God in Israel that thou goest to Baal-zebub?" whereupon with a loud voice he took up the words, and repeated them again and again, while light and joy arose in his heart. Still he looked to Daut for help of a humbler kind. For having a frequent combat with his laziness, he would have learnt the shoemaking business from the prophetical cobbler, but his whole body had grown lean and his fingers cracked and sore, which hindered him from his desire. It may indeed have been well for him that it was so, for he had always to strive against his inclinations, which would violently enter into whatever he undertook, and would dwell in them with pleasure, and the fascination of the awl and last might have won his affections from higher things. Even his knitting had a strange charm as he sat with his tackle before him: "and as I in this constantly received an inward reproach, I was often under a necessity to leave off from working, and to follow the attraction of God, who drew me softly and yet strongly into his holy presence." On one of these occasions, when he was drawn away from his work, it was suddenly disclosed to him that the activity of his intellect and the multiplicity of his desires in prayer were a hindrance to true communion. The voice spoke to him: *Thou art only a babbler! Be silent!* "This word stunned me, and made me immediately to do it, in that it gave me to perceive the intimatest unction, and a much more substantial presence of God than I had ever had in all my babbling, which I forsook from that time." The meaning of the prayer of silence had been disclosed to him. But now the body, that despised companion of the soul, began to take its revenge. Physically lowered as he was by M. Baratier's culinary economy, it is no wonder that De Marsay's desire of eating and laziness troubled him sorely; no wonder that the three members of the little community, not recognizing the cause, and attributing their state to Satan, became hysterical and light-headed. "Instead of silence and being turned inward, which hitherto we had observed, we began from morning till night to prate. My two companions were in the same situation with me. Finally we were no longer masters of ourselves. It seemed we were three merry brethren, which did nothing together the whole day but laughing, sporting, and playing the fool. This gave me great pain and sorrow. I thought, 'My God, what state is this and how will it end?' When I would reflect upon my lamentable state and endeavoured to restrain myself, a laughing so violently seized me that I thought I should burst, just as if I was possessed by a spirit who mocked my reflection and care." He was under the feet of the evil spirits, who seemed to be given power to deal with him as they pleased.

Deliverance from this lamentable condition came not through active resistance, but through entire resignation to the will of God, through yielding, without terms, at discretion, to the Father who had sent this trial as a rebuke to his self-righteousness and self-will. Were it God's will, writes De Marsay, that his fall and utter ruin should be brought about, he was prepared to consent even to this; at which the transcriber, taking alarm, appends a note: "Some reader might think that the author had here pushed the resignation too far. But such souls as are destined for so high a union with God are led through these abysses." The hysterical extravagances into which the three cenobites had found themselves falling must have led them to question the wisdom of their austerities, and it was easy for them to regard these as mere works of the law—"our severe and exactly limited manner of living received a mighty shock; it was no longer possible to stick to the rules to which we had bound ourselves." The writings of Antoinette Bourignon lost their power over De Marsay; he had learnt to renounce his own will, and the thoughts which invited him back to his past way of severity seemed a temptation of Satan. He had before him as a warning the example of his companion, Cordier, who, unwilling to enter upon the gentler way of grace, withdrew for a time into complete solitude. "But Satan seduced him through pride, and when he had found a woman that on the outside had a great appearance of spirituality, in regard to her poor and severe life, in which she as a hermit lived all alone in a little hut in a distant place, he suffered himself to be seduced by this creature, that was a bad spirit, to marry her," and so, declining from bad to worse, became in no long time an Epicurean addicted to the world and the lusts of the flesh and under the power of Satan.

Happier was De Marsay's lot when, being brought gradually into the path of humility, discretion, sobriety, and modesty, he was called to enter into the state of holy matrimony, in order that he and his wife might live together in entire bodily abstinence, yet in entire spiritual union. "One day," he writes, "when in great calmness of mind I was sitting under a tree with my knitting tackle, it was shown to me, if it was true that I was willing to be the property of God without exception, it was his will that I should give Him the first proof thereof in marrying the Lady Clara de Callenberg that then lived with the Dowager Castell." The Lady Clara was thirteen years older than her husband. She had grown up under the care of elder sisters, for at her birth her mother had become deranged and did not ever recover sanity. A deep impression had been made on the minds of the Ladies Callenberg, when Clara was about twenty-five years of age, by the conversation of certain Swiss and German pietists. As long as these spiritual teachers were persons of rank the ladies' brother endured their presence, but when two men of low descent took their place it was otherwise; the pious culprits were brought before the master of the house, who bade his servants cudgel them soundly, and then ordered them to prison. Fearing that the curse of God would descend upon their father's house, the five ladies resolved to remain in it no longer, and one Sunday, while their brother was at church, they packed up their things, dressed themselves meanly as daughters of common people, and accompanied by two maids, set forth—the seven virgins—on foot for Cassel. It was their purpose to push on to Erfurt, where living was cheap, and there support themselves by fine needlework. "While they were upon their way they saw that their brother came on horseback just meeting them, but, as he was shortsighted, they hid themselves behind a thicket of bushes on the side of the highway; so he rode past them very near without observing them." Before they could leave Cassel they were cited to appear before a commission appointed by the Landgrave to inquire into matters of religion in connection with the movement of pietism. It seemed to them that the examination was meant only to delay and harass them, and so, asking no leave, they departed on foot for Allendorf.

At this point the story of the Ladies Callenberg brings them into connection with the celebrated Eva von Buttlar, whose Philadelphian Society, founded somewhat on the model of the English associations of Pordage and Jane Leade, became infamous as a centre of the wildest extravagances of opinion, the maddest aberrations of the religious imagination, and the most reckless moral disorder. Eva had not yet risen to her highest eminence as the Door of Paradise, the New Jerusalem, the Second Eve, the Mother of us all, the Wisdom from Heaven. The little Mother (*Mama'chen*), with her companion Winter, the little Father (*Papa'chen*), and her young follower, Appenfeller, had not yet been elevated by their disciples into the Earthly Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. But when Clara de Callenberg and her sisters (among them the unhappy Sidonie, whose spiritual wedlock bore fruit in an illegitimate child), were admitted to the community of Mother Eva, there was already enough loose familiarity visible among its members to give De Marsay's future wife a great disinclination to their companionship. She could not join them in their salutations and embracings, and thought that if this was the way which led to God, she could never hope to enter into his presence. Inheriting possibly some tendency to insanity from her mother, she fell into a profound melancholy, and "often designed to throw herself into some deep pit where no one could draw her out; but the good hand of God constantly preserved her in a hidden manner." Even after she had quitted the Philadelphian Society, her mental distress continued: "When she looked out of the window and any one passed by, she drew herself back, because she believed that all that cast their eyes upon her were bewitched by that looking on her, as she firmly had persuaded herself that she was a witch, and had founded that opinion upon the thoughts that were suggested to her, viz., that when God would not help her, Satan must." Her brother kindly received her back, and she, hopeless of salvation, pleased him by returning for a time to worldly ways, though with a deep sadness in her secret heart. At length deliverance came. One day walking in the garden as she listened to the joyous songs of the birds, a sudden desire possessed her to sing a spiritual song; she entered into her chamber, sought for her Halle hymn-book, and opening it came upon the hymn, "Immanuel, whose goodness is past numbering;" she lifted up her voice and sang amid a flood of happy tears. A passage from Jacob Boehme's writings gave her courage to seek and choose the higher way; she left her brother's house, ceased from lifeless churchgoings and sacraments, and lived in holy freedom with certain godly friends at Cassel. Not indeed without trials, for she had to sustain the shock of an attack from evil spirits and the magic of certain persons (Eva's people) with whom she was before combined; at night she heard mournful voices and the hissing of serpents; but the consolations of angels would follow while she sang divine songs in a voice so much above her usual voice that it seemed to be that of some holy spirit who had joined her. The trial was ended by the vision of a Lamb with a pearl on its neck, and a book shut and beautifully bound with three silver laces—the book of her Inner State which the Lamb opened; as the evil spirit withdrew she could not refrain from calling after him, "*Be ashamed, Satan! be ashamed!*"

To draw her again into connection with Mother Eva's community, the Lady Clara's sisters sent to her, with letters of commendation proposing marriage, one Jacob Sander, the son of an apothecary of Wannefried, who, under a reputation for piety, concealed a life that was grossly vicious. Clara would have avoided him, but the arts of magic had been practised; she found it impossible to rise up, and before Sander departed, her troth had been plighted. Happily, through the influence of her brother, the license of marriage with a person so much beneath her in rank was refused, and Sander, perceiving that he would in no case receive a dowry from the Lord de Callenberg, was content to let the matter drop.

The fact that the proposal of marriage had been made and accepted was sufficiently humiliating and did not serve Clara's reputation. For her comfort and guidance she saw one day when praying a cross let down from a clear sky, and supported on each side by a hand. At the foot of the cross was a finger-ring, and the words sounded in her ears, "Espouse thyself to the Cross." With only one dollar in her pocket she withdrew to Schwartzenau, took up her abode with a pious gunsmith, and as he, his wife and new-born infant had but a single room, she would climb at night to a loft where she roosted till morning "like a hen." At a later time she was received by the Lady de Dahlwig, but still lived in poverty and self-denial. "She was a diligent spinner, went herself to the next park to fetch wood for her fuel, and was very subservient to a countrywoman with whom she kept her economy; which woman was also a good instrument used by God to exercise her in denial and subjection." Clara was thirty-eight years of age when she was joined in wedlock by the late army chaplain Baratier to De Marsay.

The joint fortune of the newly wedded pair amounted to fifteenpence; but they possessed the "capital of faith," and were under no care at all for earthly things. Clara had not married below her condition, and was accordingly entitled to a dower of two hundred florins from a public foundation in Hesse. This her husband had the prudence to secure. Cordier, the former companion of De Marsay, was about to undertake with his wife a journey to Jerusalem, and offered the bride and bridegroom the use of his little cottage perched on the declivity of a mountain amid a forest on the side of the Gersbach Valley. This clay hut, with earthen floor and one small window, enclosed a space about eight feet by eight. The nearest human habitation was quarter of a league away; Schwartzenau was twice that distance from them. But when their furniture had been removed to the cottage in a wheelbarrow, they needed nothing for their happiness: "We thought we were in Paradise, such a delight and inward peace it pleased God to give us."

The news of his marriage did not please De Marsay's mother, nor had she entire confidence in the wisdom of setting up house on the capital of faith. To quiet her apprehensions, and if possible to effect her conversion, De Marsay left his wife in the year 1713, and set off on foot for Geneva. The French were besieging Landau, which obliged him to make a detour; he was warned of dangers from robbers, but encountered none of the marauding gangs which infested the disturbed country. He walked swiftly by roads that were unknown to him, yet only once strayed from the way. When in doubt as to his path, it was his custom to shut his eyes, turn in faith to God, and proceed without reflection. But though he reached Geneva in safety, the object of his journey was not at once attained. His mother was loyal to the Reformed religion; her Separatist son set all its defects before her; "we spent our time," he writes, "chiefly in disputing." After ten days he turned his face towards Schwartzenau, and was once again in his hut upon the hillside after an absence of seven weeks.

Perhaps it was the heat aroused within him by the contention with his mother which now transformed itself into a desire to go forth and preach to all nations; in doing so, he would fain follow the example and assume the contemptible attire of the apostles. His wife had been always sickly, but she announced her intention despite every weakness to follow him throughout the world. By the wise counsel of Baratier he was led to distrust his own missionary fervour, and after a time came to look upon the design which had so strongly attracted him as a device of Satan to bring him to destruction through spiritual pride and ambition.

The household economy in the cottage was of the simplest kind: "We were quite filled with sensual sweetness [in devotion], and strongly attracted to the prayer of rest, so that we grudged the time to be spent in boiling our soup, and would therefore try to eat nothing but bread and butter and drink clear water." This diet did not suit Clara's weak health, and it was an advantage in some respects when they joined the poor widow Gruber in a somewhat larger house, quarter of a league distant from the hut. From her they learnt housekeeping; her garden was large, and two goats supplied them with milk. But the active duties enforced by the widow, though wholesome for the body, were a hard chastisement. The sweetnesses of prayer had to give way before the necessity of carrying dung up the hillside, of cutting wood or fetching grass and leaves for the goats. "It was shown to us that this honest widow was given to us to break our own will and to afford us exercise. This indeed she did in a masterly manner, and gave us daily opportunity of self-denial." After their open-air labours, an occasional treat was permitted them of little rye-meal cakes mixed with pounded yellow turnips. Flesh meat was a luxury unknown to the cottagers. They gathered wood-herbs for their food in spring, and in summer the mountain slopes provided abundance of wild strawberries.

At this time Cordier, with his wife, returned from Damascus, where they had stopped short, being unable to pay the sums demanded by the Turks for admission to the Holy Land. They settled in the unoccupied clay hut, and wore an appearance of pious self-denial; but their true principles soon appeared in an attempt to effect a separation between De Marsay and his wife, whom Madame Cordier regarded with hostility. Enraged by her failure to effect this object she induced her husband to accuse De Marsay, his wife and the widow Gruber of abominable living. They were summoned to appear before the authorities, but when the accusers were required to bring their charges home, Anna Maria Cordier could say no more than that her heavenly Father had manifested it to her. This evidence was not held to prove the defendants' guilt; Madame Cordier was told that she had her information from the devil, and so the matter ended.

The widow Gruber, though innocent of the accusations brought against her, was a tyrannous presence to her contemplative companions, with her overwhelming energy and masterful ways. "She did as much as possible according to her own will and disregarded our will; this tempted me to an averseness to her and occasioned a good deal of suffering." An amicable separation was effected, and De Marsay and his wife were once more in solitary possession of the cottage.

About this time, one day in mid-winter, a woman of the Palatinate came to visit their nearest neighbour, Mr. Gross, formerly a minister, at present a devout Separatist, the husband of Mrs. Gruber's daughter. The visitor, Sophia, had formerly known Mr. Gross, and now sought his spiritual consolation; she was in extreme distress of mind and "had enfeebled her body to a great degree by fasting, watching, laying herself in the snow and water, suffering frost, to do penance as she said." Her visit was almost at an end, for she had announced her intention to return home next day to the husband with whom she had led an unhappy life. At midnight she opened the door and slipped out into the darkness. Apprehensive lest she might hurt herself, Mr. Gross and his wife followed her, roused De Marsay and his wife, and accompanied by them searched through the wood, calling loudly on Sophia as they advanced. After some hours' search they heard a lamenting voice and found the poor woman lying quite naked upon the ice. They wrapped her in her clothes which lay scattered about, and bore her back to Mr. Gross's chamber, where, after some hours, she expired. A coffin was procured, and it was intended to bury her in Mr. Gross's garden. On the night before the burial the coffin was placed outside Mr. Gross's cottage door; but, in doing this, he and his wife were seized with an inward anguish, which was also experienced by De Marsay's wife. They felt themselves constrained by their dead sister to bring back the coffin into the little chamber; then the anguish ceased, and the four companions sat up that night and waked the corpse, being very joyful in the Lord and calm in mind, while they lifted up their voices in spiritual songs. They had an assurance that poor Sophia had been received into the grace of God, but because she had been self-willed in her severities against herself and deficient in meek resignation, it was needful that she should submit after death to a brief period of painful yet blessed purification, which she might have sustained in this life by patient suffering, but would not. As she yet entirely lived in the inner senses, and had not attained to the higher life in the spirit," "she had after death," writes De Marsay, "a power to communicate herself to our inner senses, because we were not come farther than to the state of the senses within. For the souls that live in the same ground and principle have a mutual communication."

What follows may be commended to the consideration of the Psychical Society:—

"We buried her the next day in our garden. The following night, when we were gone to rest, we heard that the door of our little house was opened. I thought I had not rightly locked it, got up to shut it, and reflected no further. The night after that door, though locked with a good lock, was again opened. I went again to fasten it and neither I nor my wife thought then that there was anything extraordinary in it. The same opening of the door happened the third night. Then we had the next day a strong impression that Sophia did thus, in visiting us, to draw comfort in her suffering condition.

"This impression seized us entirely; at night we lay down in a persuasion she would come again, and when we had extinguished our lamp our room door, which we knew was very well shut, was opened. 'This is Sophia,' whispered we to each other. I began courageously and without any terror to say to her, 'She was welcome; if she would go with us to Jesus, there we would meet one another, there alone would we be found.' I exhorted her to take her refuge to Him; if this was her resolution, as it was ours, her visit would be there pleasing to me. My wife was in fear because she had often suffered from such spirits, and pushed me to be silent. When I had done speaking, the door, which I had shut after the entry of Sophia, was opened again, and I told my wife, 'Now the soul of Sophia departs.' My wife was full of joy and called these words after her: 'Ah! my dearest Jesus, make to thyself a pure dwelling in my heart, that I may never forget Thee! May it be so with thee, poor soul; go hence into the rest of the Lord!'

"I arose again and locked our room door. After that time she never came again to visit us, but we had a strong impression that her soul was again entered into the order of the Lord, and consequently into rest also, which is always in his will and order. We have seen nothing with our corporal eyes, but the impression of her soul on ours was very calm and soft. When she opened our door it was done gently and quietly, without boisterous noise, as a token of the state in which she found herself, not in rebellion or opposition to God, but in a restful, humble suffering."

From this time onwards De Marsay's life, though it underwent no violent alteration, turned outwards; ecstasies and visions are rarer, and he moves onward in closer communion with his fellow-men, and, on the whole, with a wiser and a calmer mind. Perhaps the sufferings of poor Sophia had opened his heart in sympathy with sorrow. The change first showed itself by his employing himself in useful works on behalf of his neighbours, watching by the sick, or working with his hands for those who needed a labourer in the woods and fields. A timely gift of thirty dollars from his mother reawakened his affection for her and his desire to see her converted. Accompanied by his wife he set off (1715) once more on foot for Switzerland. They walked from six to nine leagues a day: "My wife was often as half dead with weariness. She then threw herself on the ground in the presence of God, and when thus she had rested a little while, God gave her new strength to continue her way." Clara remained at Neufchatel while her husband pushed forward to Geneva. But the meeting with his mother brought little happiness; she strongly desired that her son should find some worldly employment, and the situation of book-keeper to a great merchant in Paris was offered for his acceptance, but he could not entangle himself in the cares of business. Devout ladies welcomed De Marsay and his wife to Berne. There they spent the winter of 1715–16, preserved from overmuch society by the great snow of that year. It was not till the autumn of 1716 that, having voyaged down the Rhine, they once more found themselves in their retreat at Schwartzenau.

They looked back with a sense of shame at the faults into which intercourse even with godly persons had betrayed them, and determined to live henceforth in greater self-denial. They divided among the poor their store of victuals and such linen and other goods as they possessed; they sold their house for thirty-five dollars, distributed twenty to those who had greater need of the money than themselves, and with the remaining fifteen dollars bought a little room on the impoverished ground of Christianseck, a solitary place on a height, where stood a few scattered houses inhabited by pious people, about a league from Schwartzenau. But light and joy did not attend this self-denial: "I went and spent half-days in the wood in the hope of recovering spiritual sweetnesses in that solitude, but all in vain. How much soever I endeavoured to enjoy the presence of God, in a manner that conveys delight to the inner senses, it was all without effect, and I perceived my gradual falling into dryness and aridity."

During these days De Marsay willingly accepted the alms volunteered to him by godly persons. But he now questioned whether this could be rightly done, since he might claim from his brother a portion of the family property, and his wife was entitled to a share of her brother's wealth. Husband and wife, though not possessed of twopence, determined to start on their several journeys, the one to Paris on his way to the home of the De Marsays near La Rochelle, the other to the lands of the house of Callenberg near Cassel. A friend furnished them with a few dollars, and they bade each other farewell. "On my way, as I travelled alone," De Marsay writes, "I had a strong impression that God had assigned me an angel for a companion, whereof I was so sure, as if I had seen him with my corporal eyes; this made me to travel with a joyful mind through an unknown land." On reaching the French frontier he feared that he might be arrested if he were known to be a Frenchman entering from foreign territory. "The means I used to prevent this was to clean my shoes, and to fit myself up as if I was no traveller. Thus the sentry permitted me freely to pass at the gate of Verdun, which was the first city I passed. I had no pack nor baggage, and but a shirt in my pocket. After the guard had let me pass, I was called back again and asked, 'Sir, from whence do you come?' to which a sergeant that was there replied, 'Let him pass, he is a man of Sirk' (Sirk is a little city two hours form Verdun, and belongs to the Elector of Trier). I said, 'I come from Sirk;' thus they took me for a German, and suffered me to pass without further examination." On October 18, 1717, he entered Paris.

It was the time of Law's financial schemes, when De Marsay, occupied with his private financial affairs, reached the capital. To his surprise he learnt that his brother had been appointed British envoy at Geneva, and was no longer in France. A kind letter assured the penniless wanderer of his brother's warm goodwill, and enabled him to procure an ample supply of money. His wife had been less fortunate, but now they were placed above want, and it was arranged that she should proceed to Berne where her husband would rejoin her after he had visited his kinsfolk at Geneva. The change was great from their previous state of poverty, and De Marsay feared lest it might fare ill with his soul amid this worldly prosperity. But Providence, as he felt, was leading him even by such gentle means, to humility and a surrender of his own will. "God pulled all my pillars away which I had secretly built up in my manner of living formerly practised, and He removed me besides out of that lightsome faith full of assurance and certainty, in which hitherto we had stood, and made me enter into that mere or bare and dark faith which is divested of all those certainties, and in which you must be led as a child without light by the hand of the parent." His brother was surprised and pleased to find him so little of the austere ascetic; in a few days they became very good friends, and went together to sermons and holy communion, a concession which had not been expected from the recluse. A yearly allowance was assigned to De Marsay, and when a little later he departed for Berne he took with him his brother's best wishes.

For a considerable time he remained in Switzerland, finding both at Berne and Vevay persons of his own way of thinking. Although his outward self-denials were fewer than before, he felt more strongly than ever "the attraction to the Centre," which draws the will into harmony with the Divine will. "This attraction and impulse is so spiritual, and so far above all what is in the sphere of the senses or reason, that they cannot reach to it;" of such inconceivable subtlety that when you desire clearly to know and consider it, the attraction disappears and is gone. A new and strange anxiety, however, troubled him; he feared that his annual income might not suffice for his expenditure, and, moved by this and other causes, he decided to return to his little room at Christianseck. On the journey, about half a league from Bâle, his wife became seriously ill; it was evening, no house was near, and the passers-by were hastening to enter the city before the gates should close. "I confess that among all the trials that had befallen us this was one of the most sensible—to be near the gates of a large city without the least assistance. I fancied no one in the world was so unhappy as we, that could stay in no place but were fugitives like Cain." Night drew on, his wife's death seemed imminent, and he could not bear to leave her alone while he sought for help. "At last, after some hours' suffering, my wife found a little ease. I went softly along with her, and we arrived in the city, going through a great part of it till we came to the Baroness de Planta, who received us kindly and procured us a lodging."

Once more in a house of his own at Christianseck, De Marsay felt the need of some regular occupation, without which he could not keep his "ground," knew not where he was, and even feared that he might fall into libertinism. His mother would have been pleased to see him return to the military profession, and he was ready to submit even to this, but his brother wisely opposed a project so little suited to his temper of mind. A better way was opened for him when Divine Providence brought a good soul to lodge with him, one Godfrey Koch, "a watchmaker and an Israelite in whom was no guile." Together the two men studied the mysteries of wheels and pinions and escapements: together they pored over the deeper mysteries of the soul as explained in the spiritual writings of Madame Guyon. In the course of a year De Marsay had acquired much skill and knowledge in his craft as watchmaker. A great circuit had been traversed from the ambitious days when he dreamed of playing the part of an apostle through all lands: "Now I saw myself as one cast to the ground, and reduced to that abject state as to work from morning till night upon a watch and to be busy about earthly things. This was a great abasement in the eyes of my self-loving spirit, but my ground rejoiced and whispered to me, 'See! thy pride is stung at eating grass like an ox with Nebuchadnezzar, but really such material things are at this time better and less dangerous for the sensual and rational part of the soul, or for her inferior part, than the spiritual matters, when the soul will take them into her own comprehension and capacity, and this is that death which is absolutely necessary; by it God will bring thee to the life of the spirit, that the Centre may be discovered and disentangled.'" Seven years were thus spent in quietness and patient work, without any remarkable external events.

In 1724 his wife's declining health, which suffered from the cold air of Christianseck, induced De Marsay to move to Heidelberg. Here he continued his work as watchmaker under a more skilful master than Koch, but all the deftness of his fingers seemed to be lost. He was as awkward as if he had never handled a file. "I observed," he tells us, "that God would restrain me from being entangled and captivated by this mechanical spirit, and not permit that I should become so ingenious and accomplished a watchmaker. This made me tired of the subtile working." The more delicate craft expected by his Heidelberg master, no doubt, was unattainable by the elderly pupil of a journeyman like Koch.

The illness of his mother brought De Marsay again to Switzerland. He was saddened to find that many of his former friends had turned back to the world. Among these was the Abbé de Watteville, a correspondent of Madame Guyon; he was now married, and declared that all that had passed with him in the days of his fervid faith was like a dream; "in short everywhere was misery and dissipation to be seen among our old friends, with a mortal deadness, and we ourselves knew not where we were." An invitation from the Countess of Wittgenstein-Berleburg determined De Marsay and his wife to fix their abode in her neighbourhood. They were warmly received at Berleburg by high and low; so much time indeed now began to be spent in useless conversations that De Marsay decided to entertain his visitors by reading aloud a sermon for them; but somehow this edifying species of good-fellowship did not entirely succeed. He longed for solitude, and yet in solitude he suffered much misery. It was a comfort to him when he learnt, first from books and then in his own experience, that involuntary dissipations of the imagination do not necessarily hinder the prayer of rest. Three times a day he placed himself without trouble or commotion of mind in the mental attitude of prayer, and accepted whatever degree of the spirit of devotion might be granted to him. And now, through the persuasions of "the famous Dr. Carl," he was induced to take a part in certain assemblies where every one had liberty to propose a divine matter, to speak concerning the same, or to pray. For some weeks all went well, and every one pressed to these meetings of the devout; but the concord and communion of saints were of short duration. "Spiritual pride, love of mastership, spiritual voluptuousness, and all other abominations of this sort, a desire of new things, curiosity, envy, hatred, sensual adherence followed one another successively, and all these poisonous animals entered our meeting. It is true they came not barefaced but masked." Many high-flying spirits would consent to no way but their own. De Marsay began to perceive that congregations or societies of this kind cannot subsist without human laws ordained to restrain the spirits within the limits of reason, decency, and regularity. The overflowing pleasure which he had felt at first in his own extempore prayers seemed to him before long to be rather a carnal than a spiritual delight.

Soon after his arrival at Berleburg letters had come from America, describing Pennsylvania as an earthly Paradise. With two or three hundred dollars one might purchase a considerable parcel of land; the soil was fruitful; there was full liberty of conscience to live as a good Christian in solitude; there was employment for all, and especially good employment for one skilled in watchmaking. A large number of persons, nearly one hundred, resolved to emigrate, and De Marsay, with his wife, had a mind to join the party. His mother and brother, however, strongly opposed the project, and for a time it was dropped. When it was revived in 1726, De Marsay contrasted in his fancy the charm of solitude in the earthly Paradise in Pennsylvania with the bickering and backbiting of the religious meetings at Berleburg. He was ready to depart, and had taken leave of his friends, when letters arrived, giving a lamentable description of the misery endured by the emigrants; many had died from the hardships of the voyage, among them the good old widow Gruber and her daughter. At first it seemed to De Marsay as if these tidings were a call to him to endure hardness, and that the prospect of suffering and death made it more than ever desirable that he should commit himself to God and embark. He saw, as in a vision, his wife dying in great misery and her body thrown into the sea. His heart was touched to the quick, yet he could not desist from his resolution. But a way of escape was opened : "One evening when I was preparing for rest, and in my prayers placed myself and my wife before God as two animals of sacrifice, that with full consent and surrender would expect nothing else but to be offered up, there rose at once from my inner ground a soft and placid conviction in my understanding, which showed me, 'It was enough ; the sacrifice was made, we had now offered our Isaac, God did not require any more from us ;' and this offering of Abraham was in a quite peculiar manner represented to me, with an addition of signifying that we should no longer think of the voyage, but keep ourselves quiet." This sufficed for the occasion ; but it was afterwards shown to De Marsay that the desire he had for outward solitude in the Transatlantic wilds was an impure passion, having selfishness for its chief ingredient.

In September, 1730, the Count von Zinzendorf arrived at Schwartzenau, whither De Marsay still resorted in the summer. Zinzendorf was by many years the younger man, but he was already famous for his talents as well as his piety, and had already established his common order of worship for the brethren at Herrnhut. De Marsay and his wife dined with him at the house of the Countess Dowager de Wittgenstein : "but notwithstanding all the good opinion the public had of him, it appeared to my wife as if he had such a physiognomy, more internally than outwardly, which was quite contrary to her, and made her to have an aversion against him." From Schwartzenau the Count proceeded to Berleburg, and there every day held spiritual assemblies, where by his fine appearance and humble yet eloquent words he drew many souls captive. Among these, notwithstanding their dislike on first acquaintance, were the De Marsays, and it may perhaps have been that the magic of evil spirits, against which De Marsay afterwards wrote, contributed to the fascination. An attempt was made to establish at Berleburg another community like that of Herrnhut. On three successive Sundays De Marsay supplied the place of a brother who had fallen sick, and preached with such unction and power that he himself wondered at it, for he had never before delivered a public discourse. It almost seemed as if it were in his choice to become another Zinzendorf. He stood, as it were, at the parting of the ways. Should the watchmaker rise into the apostle ? His answer was given without hesitation : "When I was in my prayer the choice was given me inwardly, whether I would be enriched with the like gifts to edify my neighbour, and by being endued with extraordinary talents, that bear a great appearance, be esteemed as a saint among the godly . . . whether I would be in a state of a clear light and tasting faith, which enables us to apply these talents with a great perception in the senses, and with a zeal that conquers them ; or whether I would choose to be stripped of all these things and to die off from them in the way of a dark faith and terrible desert that had no end but to die off from all. The inclination of my ground did then without any hesitation immediately choose the latter state and rejected the first." And from that moment all his gifts of unction and eloquence departed from him. He withdrew from the public assemblies of the saints, and would enter into no dispute with this one or that—"It is best to be silent and keep your mystery to yourself." His wife, with some uncertainty as to whether she was right, followed his example. When any person would persuade her that her conduct was erroneous she defended it with energy, but as soon as the person was gone her former doubts returned.

The sometime Separatist, De Marsay, now desired to frequent again the Reformed Church, after he had "got rid of all the little divided sects that had occasioned us so much suffering and with which we would have no further connection." Not that he would allow church-going to be a slavery ; he still claimed the liberty to attend public worship or to stay away as he was moved by his inward "ground." He had through much pain and shuddering awe been given "a propensity to that pure intuition, which is the continual office and privilege of the seraphim," but he no longer undervalued the outward ordinances of religion. He had seen at Schwartzenau the miserable results of the Separatist movement on young people, who had been brought up without attendance at the services of the Church, who had not inherited the internal godliness of their parents, and who had given themselves up in many instances to the spirit of libertinism. Still for his own part he was happiest alone with his Bible or his *De Imitatione—in angello cum libello.* And a way of usefulness to others was discovered to him when in 1734 he found that he could employ his pen with good effect in the cause of religion. It seemed to him that he was like a man "that for many years on a long voyage had been carried through many unknown countries with tied-up eyes; when the band that blindfolded him is removed all is a wonder to him when he reviews all the ways through which he has been led." In September of that year he felt as though the pure fire of the Divine love possessed him wholly: "one night especially, which I shall never forget, God alone knows what then passed; it is beyond description; I must not speak of it, but be silent and adore. Only this I will mention, that from that period of time all my troubles, anxieties, and griefs are vanished, there is now no care nor sorrow for anything whatever remaining." We shall not pry with conjecture into that mystery of joy.

On February 21, 1742, after twenty-nine years of spiritual union, for in this sense only was it marriage, De Marsay lost his wife. Two letters which he wrote on that occasion are preserved. The closing weeks of her life were darkened by a terrible despair of her salvation. "She experienced," writes her husband, "the descension to hell with Christ," nor was there any lightening of her anguish before the end. It was happy that before this sorrow, De Marsay had gained a dear friend in M. de Fleischbein, who had first sought his services as a watchmaker, and afterwards had come to love him with a brotherly affection. Other friends were found in some young kinsfolk of his own, children of his second sister, the Lady de Carlot. His elder years were calm and happy. The substance of his faith in its final form is thus expressed in his own words:

"I have lost all thoughts of a mystical state, and rest humbly and simply on the grace in Jesus Christ. . . . Not that I reject or disbelieve the truth and substance of all the mystical states whereof I have wrote. No! but the thoughts, the form and the image of them is taken away from me by the afore-mentioned state of humiliation." To the last, however, his devout habit of discovering special providences in the incidents of his life remains. He had found that the use of a prayer-book was necessary to him for purposes of private devotion and had chosen Gottfried Arnold's *Prayers of the Spirit.* He had presented his own copy to a certain nobleman, and tried to procure another copy, but all in vain: "this made me believe it was not the will of God I should any longer offer my prayers to him in that fashion. And really from that time it pleased him in his infinite goodness to restore to me gradually the attraction to the simple internal prayer, whether in silence in his presence, or in words expressed by love, or in simple thoughts and love-affections, quite unrestrained and free as it pleased Him to give."

At Ambleben on February 3, 1753, De Marsay died aged sixty-five. M. de Botticher, his sister's son-in-law, and the Pastor Gerhard were with him during his illness. He looked foward to his death with cheerfulness. "I swim and bathe in joy," he said a few days before his death, "that I shall now soon obtain what, through the grace of our Saviour, I have so long ardently wished and hoped for." Only one harsh gesture was observed before he drew his last breath.

I have ended my task as recorder of this fragment in the history of Eighteenth-Century Pietism. If there be morals to be drawn and practical applications, I must leave these to the reader.

TESTIMONIALS TO THE LATE BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Jan. 11, 1890.

The death of the Bishop of Durham brings a deep sense of sorrow and bereavement, not to his diocese alone, nor yet merely to the Church of England, but to the whole of Christendom. To speak of only one thing, his scholarship was a possession of the entire Church, and a gift to all who name the name of Christ.

One can hardly help a feeling of regret that he was not left at Cambridge to do the work which none could do as he did, instead of being transferred to such a diocese as Durham; where the attempt to continue his own special work side by side with the discharge of his official duty has broken him down at the age of sixty-one.

We do not, assuredly, undervalue the "office and work of a bishop." But there are other things which the Church needs as well as what he can do. And what stands higher among those other things than just such work as Dr. Lightfoot was doing when he was taken away from it and sent to Durham? One must feel that it is a poor economy of the "diversities of gifts" when men are taken from lines of labor for which God originally fitted them, and for which, under

Him, they have trained themselves, and are burdened with what they do, admirably indeed, but what others might hope to do as well; and, meantime, are estopped from that which none can do as they can. Such regrets are, no doubt, vain, but one cannot help lamenting such seeming waste.

Possibly Dr. Lightfoot's greatest work—great it certainly is—will be considered to be his volumes on Ignatius and Polycarp. It may well be the boast of our mother Church that two of her prelates, Pearson in the seventeenth and Lightfoot in the nineteenth century, have accomplished for the Ignatian Epistles what no others—Zahn can hardly be reckoned as an exception—have accomplished. It suits certain persons, some of whom have never read him, to sneer now at Bishop Pearson. But his "Vindiciæ Epistolarum Sti. Ignatii" was as remarkable a treatise for its time as Bishop Lightfoot's is now. The two together are a monument to the scholarship of the mother Church which the devouring tooth of time will never destroy.

The latest of his works, the defence of the supernatural character of our holy religion—not the latest in point of actual composition, but as gathering into one volume what had not before been collected—deserves to stand by the side of the immortal work of another great Bishop of Durham, so worthily characterized by Southey.

But it is, after all, as a commentator on, and expounder of, Holy Scripture that Bishop Lightfoot claims, it seems to us, his greatest pre-eminence. It is one of the unhappy results of the present tendency "*jurare in verba magistri,*" that so many seek a leader whom they can blindly follow, rather than a teacher to whom they can intelligently listen. Hence, if there is disagreement on a single point, the man and his work are both rejected, and, because he cannot be followed in everything, he is listened to in nothing.

In saying this we have in mind Bishop Lightfoot's dissertation on the Christian Ministry appended to his commentary on Philippians. There can be no doubt that the dissertation has been widely used in the interests of Parity—or one might better say of Indifferentism—in regard to any ministry at all in the Church; for that is what the theory of Parity has developed into. But it is very significant that the bishop himself has said, "I do not hold myself responsible for the interpretations which others (whether friends or opponents) have put upon my language, or for the inferences which they have drawn from my views." We, certainly, cannot accept the theory that the Episcopate is a growth upward from the Presbyterate, and not a localization of the Apostolate. But no one who reads the dissertation can fail to note—we quote the words of its principal opponent—"its thoroughly accurate and profound research, its calm judicial tone, and, above all, its transparent impartiality, leading the writer to distrust conclusions in favor of his own clerical position rather than the contrary."

Indeed, the very first feeling one has in reading the bishop's commentaries—alas that we are to have no more!—is that he is in communication with a thoroughly genuine and fair-minded man—a man to whom one's confidence may be freely given. Nor is this fair-mindedness that mawkish and miscalled candor which is so afraid of offending an opponent that it prefers to be faithless to the truth. It is anything, indeed, but that. At the same time, it always prevents and holds back the understatement of a difficulty, and still more does it forbid its suppression. We are confident that the late Bishop of Durham was at all times ready to admit that in the Epistles of St. Paul are "some things hard to be understood," some things, in truth, which the most learned commentator—to say nothing of the youngest clergyman—cannot explain.

Then, again, to Bishop Lightfoot, St. Paul was a living man, "of like passions with ourselves," and not a lay-figure. He wrote to living men, with their actual surroundings, conditions and circumstances, and not to other lay-figures. And hence his Epistles are living words, in interpreting which the writer's own characteristics, line of address and methods of dialectic are to be taken into account, and also the circumstances and conditions just alluded to as well as the rules of grammar. For it must not be forgotten, to use the words of the venerable Bishop of Fredericton, that "Inspiration controls and modifies the thoughts, but does not alter the character, of the mind which is inspired." With Dr. Lightfoot, then, the Epistles of the Apostle of the Gentiles are something more than a *hortus siccus* of grammatical and verbal specimens to be duly ticketed, inscribed, and laid away in their appropriate receptacles.

To illustrate what we mean: In commenting on that passage in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians which has so racked the wits of writers who have attempted to explain its construction, the passage, namely, in which St. Paul is speaking of the case of Titus, Dr. Lightfoot gives up the grammar as hopeless, and seeks help elsewhere. On the entire passage he says, "St. Paul is here distracted between the fear of saying too much and the fear of saying too little. . . . In this conflict of aims and feelings the sense of the passage is well-nigh lost. . . . From this shipwreck of grammar it is difficult to extricate the main incident." And again on v. 4 ("and that because of false brethren, etc.") he says, "at this point the connection of the sentence is snapped. . . . The counsels of the Apostles of the Circumcision are the hidden rock on which the grammar of the sentence is wrecked." On this same verse another commentator well learned, but very verbal, says, "The construction here is not perfectly perspicuous, but it does not appear necessary either to regard it as a positive anacoluthon, or an anacoluthon arising from two blended constructions." Who does not at once feel the world-wide difference between these two modes of exposition? Of course grammar and verbal criticism have their own important place in the exegesis of Holy Scripture. But a good many other things are required to make a living interpreter of a living word: and these other things Dr. Lightfoot had.

Much more might be said, but we must close this imperfect tribute to a truly great man; great in the simplicity of his godly life; great in his abundant alms-giving, great in the intellectual gifts which God had given him; great in his acquired learning; greatest of all in his deep and unfeigned humility, in his lowly estimation of himself. If we cannot say of him as Milton said of Lycidas that he is "dead, dead ere his prime," may we not say "he hath not left his peer"?

From *The Standard of the Cross and the Church* (Episcopalian), Philadelphia, Jan. 11, 1890.

It has been a long fortnight that we have been awaiting on this side the ocean something more than the bare announcement of the death and burial of the lamented theologian and prelate, Dr. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham. The bereavement of the American part of the lettered and Christian world has been aggravated not a little by the unaccountable silence of the cable despatches of our secular press correspondents upon this great loss. But whatever the incompetence of some, and the unfortunate negligence of others of these telegraphic authorities, the suspense is now broken by the arrival of English mails, bringing the appreciative utterances of able minds through press and pulpit. The loss is universally and generally recognized by scholars as that of the foremost of their brotherhood. Our London correspondent recites what Canon Liddon said of the departed Bishop in a sermon the day following his death, as well as the high estimate of his scholarship pronounced by the London *Times*. The *Guardian* says: "The Church of England can ill afford to lose one in whom critical and patriotic scholarship of the highest order was combined with eminent devotion to the work of his Diocese and singular beauty of character."

Joseph Barber Lightfoot was born April 13th, 1828, at Liverpool, a younger son of Mr. John Jackson Lightfoot, accountant, of that city. His earliest education was at the school connected with the Royal Institution in Liverpool, and afterward at the grammar school then under Dr. J. Prince Lee, afterward first Bishop of Manchester. "Here," says the *Manchester Guardian*, "Lightfoot formed one of a trio of remarkable boys—'three boys,' it is said, 'Prince Lee loved more than any one else in the world, and in whom he took every human interest in pushing forward'—the other two being the present Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Benson) and Dr. Brooke Foss Westcott. In 1854 he was ordained by his old Birmingham master, Bishop Prince Lee, at St. John's Church, Heaton Mersey."

He was graduated with highest honors from Trinity College, Cambridge, and became a Fellow of Trinity in 1852. In 1861 he became Hulsean Professor of Divinity, and in 1875 Margaret Professor. In 1871 he was appointed Canon Residentiary at St. Paul's Cathedral. Says the *Times*: "His name will always be cherished in that cathedral as one of its great ornaments. His influence there was of the utmost value, as he brought the gifts of his unsurpassed learning to the work of the practical instruction of a great London audience." But it was his influence and energy in the university life of Cambridge that this journal accounts of incalculable importance. The account continues:

"The peculiar service which was rendered by him and the 'Cambridge School' was that, instead of opposing a mere dogmatic opposition to the Tübingen critics, they met them frankly at once on their own ground; and instead of arguing that their conclusions ought not to be and could not be true, they simply proved that their facts and their premises were wrong.

"Dr. Lightfoot, when once engaged in an inquiry such as that respecting the Epistles of St. Ignatius, pushed his researches into every field and corner of learning connected with the subject, and would not rest till every circumstance had been investigated which could throw light upon it. This unwearying and fastidious conscientiousness has no doubt been rewarded by the permanence of his work; but it has had one consequence which must forever be regretted. It was one of the causes which prevented the completion of the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles. The earliest of this great series of commentaries—that on the Epistle to the Galatians—was published in 1865. This was followed in 1868 by a Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, and in 1875 by a Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon; and there, alas! this invaluable series came to a close.

"In 1879 he accepted the Bishopric of Durham. The appointment has been eminently justified by the result. The Bishop never ceased his learned labors, and his grand work on the Ignatian Epistles was completed amidst the discharge of his diocesan duties. But he devoted himself with unstinted energy to the practical work of his see, and soon became beloved and trusted throughout his Diocese for the impulse and support which he gave to every good work. His munificence was understood to be unbounded, and one of his last acts was to build a church at Sunderland as a thank-offering for what every one hoped was his recovery from illness last year. His name will be held in the highest honor as long as the English Church lasts—or rather as long as any Church lasts in which English or European theology is known."

Bishop Lightfoot was never married. His death occurred at Bournemouth Saturday, December 21st, 1889. The funeral was at Durham Cathedral, Friday, St. John's Day, and the interment at Auckland Castle.

From *Zion's Herald* (Methodist), Boston, Jan. 8, 1890.

PERHAPS no member of the episcopate of the Established Church of England of late years has won for himself a wider and more lasting fame in the great commonwealth of sacred letters, or imposed a stronger obligation on the gratitude of Christian scholars, than the late Bishop of Durham. It is difficult to measure the extent or duly estimate the value of the service he has rendered to the royal science of theology in the several departments of apologetics, hermeneutics and historical criticism during a life less remarkable for its length than for its exemplary industry and fruitfulness.

For more than two centuries the ancient University of Cambridge has cherished a pardonable pride in the name of Lightfoot. Just as Trinity to-day glories in the exalted piety, the thorough scholarship and the enduring achievements of John Barber Lightfoot, so Christ's claims association with the brilliant renown of the author of the *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ,* who was educated there two centuries and a half ago and subsequently became master of Catharine's Hall and afterwards vice-chancellor of the University. The earlier Lightfoot was one of the ablest and confessedly the most learned of the many distinguished men who sat in the Westminster Assembly of divines and who formulated that noblest of post-Reformation symbols—the "Westminster Confession of Faith," whose days now appear to be numbered. His intimate and thorough knowledge of rabbinical literature was remarkable for his day, though far surpassed by many advanced Hebraists in our own time.

The University of Cambridge has never shared the notoriety of Oxford as the source of great movements in the religious life and thought of England. In the long list of eminent men she has given to the world she cannot point to a Wesley or a Newman. Her influence on theological thought and learning has been of a quieter and more conservative and probably deeper kind. Oxford has been like an old hen hatching young eagles unawares, and when the birds fostered by her maternal wing have developed their pinions and begun to soar, she has been astonished, if not alarmed, at their strange and unexpected movements. Methodism, the creation (humanly speaking) of the greatest of her sons, she has never understood, and probably never will. Nor has she been less perplexed with the less praiseworthy and less permanent work of Pusey, Keble, and John Henry Newman. Cambridge has at least understood the most eminent of her children; has watched their distinguished careers with undisguised approval, and with a just maternal pride holds their names in enduring honor. Not the least of these was Dr. John Barber Lightfoot. Born in the city of Liverpool in 1828, he graduated from Trinity College in 1851, was the following year elected fellow, took orders in 1854, and in 1857 became tutor of his college. Four years later he was appointed honorary chaplain to the Queen and Hulsean professor of divinity in the University. A few years later he became examining chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; in 1871 a canon residentiary of St. Paul's Cathedral; and a few years subsequently, after considerable hesitation, accepted appointment to the bishopric of Durham.

The claims of an English diocese to-day on the time and energies of its overseer are far more imperative, exacting and continuous than they used to be before Nonconformity acquired its present political influence and animus, and the Liberation Society began to direct its artillery against the ancient stronghold of the Establishment; and when the Church of England claimed Dr. Lightfoot's labors as a bishop, it was feared that the larger church outside the sectional one would lose his invaluable labors as a skilled and scholarly exegete, polemic and theologian. That fear has not been justified. Both his work on the "Ignatian Epistles" and his recently published reply to the "great unknown" whose anonymous work on "Supernatural Religion" created for a time such an unwarranted sensation in the theological world a few years ago, have appeared since his elevation. Many of the more flagrant and obvious errors and misstatements of that pretentious critic of historical Christianity had already met with masterly overhauling and merciless exposure at the hands of Dr. Lightfoot's life-long friend, the venerable Dr. Brooke Foss Westcott of Trinity College, in the lengthy preface to the fourth edition of his "History of the Canon of the New Testament." "It would scarcely be worth while to refer to the startling mistranslations of Greek and Latin which occur from time to time," says Dr. Westcott, "if the author did not most justly insist on the necessity of rigorous exactness." "The author of 'Supernatural Religion,'" he continues, "strives, I doubt not, to be fair; but in spite of an ostentation of justice, he falls into errors of fact far more frequently than an accurate scholar (as I believe) could do." The leading points assailed by the anonymous critic are vigorously defended by Westcott, but many points of minor consequence are left unnoticed. Dr. Lightfoot's book takes a wider scope, and is an examination—critical, complete, exhaustive—of the entire field of debate.

In the death of the great scholar cautious and conservative criticism has lost one of its most skilful and most capable leaders; evangelical theology has lost one of its truest friends and one of its ablest exponents; the Church of England has lost one of its brightest ornaments, and the church universal one of its most catholic-spirited members. Though a loyal son of the English Church, his fine critical instinct, to say nothing of his sense of fairness and his love of truth, withheld him from sanctioning the miserable old figment of apostolic succession, or claiming the exclusive sanction of divine authority, for episcopacy. His fine dissertation on "St. Paul and Seneca" exhibits the largeness of his soul as well as his unerring critical sagacity, while that on the "Christian Ministry" shows how impossible it was for him "to give to a party what was meant for mankind."

CHRIST A POOR MAN.

BY PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D.

From *The Central Christian Advocate* (Methodist), St. Louis, Dec. 25, 1889.

The Christ of Christmas Day at His birth and through all His life was poor. That fact we know full well. The picture on the pages of the Gospel with which our eyes are so familiar never lets us forget it. There it always is—the humble company shut out of the great caravansary as insignificant people and finding their place among the cattle; the perfect destitution of all the things which make life splendid or even comfortable; the carpenter's shop, the long foot journeys, the "not having where to lay His head." We know it all; and yet sometimes it comes back to us with something almost like discovery and surprise. Was it then true? Did that which all men are accepting as the pattern life come into the world, and go through the world, and go out of the world, without a single sign of any care about those things which the great mass of men are struggling after as if there could be no joy in life without them? Let a stranger come here and see our business world. Let him walk through our business streets, and be told that this is a Christian city and these are Christian men. Let him watch their anxious faces. Let him listen to their feverish talk. Let him read the bulletins which they are devouring with hungry eyes. Let him get thoroughly into the soul of this determined, furious pursuit of wealth, and then let him suddenly be told that the great Master of these men, He after whose name almost all of them want to be called, never had any and never wanted to have any of this wealth to the pursuit of which all these men's lives are given; must he not be surprised? Ah! how vulgar and poor it makes the hunt for money seem! How it ought to break some of these heavy chains! It is not necessary that you should be rich. There is no need of it whatever. Behold, He who struck the highest, purest note of human life, He who showed God to man, He who brought man to God, He who redeemed the world—He was not rich, but poor. O blessed fact! What if it had been a rich man that had saved the world? How, conspiring with all man's native passion to be rich, the sight of the Rich Redeemer would have enlisted all our best ambitions in the struggle for the money which must then have come to seem indispensable for the best life and work! How terrible that would have been! Heaven and hell almost confederate to make the soul of man the slave to gold! But now how different! Now the life of Christ may be misread into a false glorification of poverty, but it never can be made to preach cupidity. Now he who reads the story of Christ's life knows that to be rich is not, and never can be, the worthy object of a human life. He who reads that story despises his own passion for money. He feels dropping out of his heart his base and brutal contempt for the poor man. And the poor man himself fills his soul with self-respect and strength beside the cradle of the poor Jesus. Oh, my dear friends! is it not true that poor and rich, in themselves and toward each other, can never be what they ought to be so long as to both money seems to be the one desirable thing in life? If that be so, must not the first leaf from the tree which is for the healing of the nations come in this fact, that the Son of man—the Man of men, the Man who lived the richest life this world has ever seen—was born and lived and died in poverty?

A FORGOTTEN DISTINCTION.

BY PROFESSOR A. S. COATS.

From *The Standard* (Baptist), Chicago, Jan. 16, 1890.

"WHAT difference it makes whether one 'believes Jesus' or 'believes in Jesus' much thought has not enabled me to discover." One hardly knows at which fact to express the greater surprise—the ignorance as thus expressed by Professor Huxley of the most obvious, most fundamental, most heaven-high, hell-deep distinction in New Testament Christianity, which he undertakes in several numbers of *The Nineteenth Century* for 1889 so learnedly to discuss, or the failure of his equally learned antagonist, Henry Wace, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, and principal of King's College, London, to enlighten him as to that distinction. It is owing to this failure and this failure alone, that the undignified controversy between these two champions of Agnosticism and Christianity respectively was waged with such varying fortunes through six numbers of the *Century*, and that at its close the friends of either side found it possible with almost equal propriety to claim the victory.

Dr. Wace, at the Manchester church congress, 1888, read a paper in which he asserted: "It is and ought to be an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe Jesus Christ." He further asserted that though such a man "may prefer to call himself an agnostic, his real name is an older one—he is an infidel." Professor Huxley, who so far as the word "infidel" is concerned prefers the game without the name, while he is even more anxious that the world should not forget that though he did not invent agnosticism he at least named it, feels himself personally affronted by this designation "infidel," since he and his prefer the title "agnostic." Thus the battle begins. In Professor Huxley's first onset he says: "'It is and it ought to be,' authoritatively declares this official representative of Christian ethics (Dr. Wace), 'an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ.' This he interprets as meaning: that honest disbelief in their (the churches') more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offence, indeed, a sin of the deepest dye, deserving and involving the same future retribution as murder and robbing." Dr. Wace in reply virtually admits that belief *in* Jesus Christ may be taken as equivalent to belief "of the Christian creed as a whole," while he shows that he was not referring to such belief at all, "but to Jesus Christ as a person, and regarded as a witness to certain primary truths which an Agnostic will not accept."

What different reading should we have had if Dr. Wace had seen fit to show the valiant champion of theological knownothingism, at this point, that belief in Jesus Christ, while it is in no sense synonymous with belief in the creeds of the church, is also a vastly, a fundamentally different thing from believing "Jesus Christ as a person and regarded as a witness to certain primary truths which an agnostic will not acknowledge!" Had he chosen to show this learned heathen, whom "much thought" has not enabled to see "what difference it makes whether one believes Jesus or believes in Jesus," what it is "to believe in Jesus," he would naturally have had recourse to some such line of argument as the Master used in his interview with the learned Jew, Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know and bear witness to that we have seen and ye receive not our witness. If I told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?" Or he might with equal propriety have shown this modern unregenerated Saul of Tarsus, who with more modern but none the less effective weapons persecutes the Church of God and makes havoc of it, how his greater prototype was engaged in exactly the same business until, as he says, "It was the good pleasure of God to reveal his Son in me." How that then and there his eyes were opened; and he "was not disobedient to the heavenly vision; but declared both to them of Damascus first, and at Jerusalem and throughout all the country of Judea and also to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, doing works worthy of repentance." This would naturally have led him to refer to the way that this same Saul—now a new man in Christ Jesus with a new name—dealt with the wise agnostics of Greece: "For the word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness; but unto us which are being saved it is the power of God. . . . For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe. . . . As it is written:

'Things which eye saw not and ear heard not,
And which entered not into the heart of man,
Whatsoever things God prepared for them that
love him'

but unto us God revealed them through the Spirit. . . . Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, and he cannot know them because they are spiritually judged, but he that is spiritual judgeth all things." If further testimony were needed he would probably have turned to that of the beloved disciple: "This is the message which we have heard from him and announced unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. . . . If we walk in the light as he is in the light we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin. . . . And hereby know we that we know him if we keep his commandments."

In a word, had Dr. Wace seen fit to show Professor Huxley "what difference it makes whether one believes Jesus or believes in Jesus," he would have been led to discover to him the New Testament doctrine of the new birth. He would have been led to show him that Christianity does not simply claim to be a supernatural religion, but that it also demands in man, and offers to man a supernatural enlightenment in order to its understanding. This is what may be called the New Testament short method in dealing with agnostics, and this is the only method the New Testament sanctions. Would it have cut short the now famous Wace-Huxley controversy very soon after it had begun to drag its weary course through the first six months of 1889? Granted, and also that Professor Huxley and all the indifferentism of the age that gladly hides its lazy head under the word agnosticism, would have met such a turn in the controversy with a loud guffaw. Even this were far better than to carry to the world the idea which the world so eagerly welcomes, that unbelief is an intellectual, not a moral disease, and that to be convinced of the truth of the Christian religion is to be a Christian. The devils have no doubt of the truth of Christianity, but they make and live lies instead. Had Dr. Wace succeeded in his ill-advised attempt, in convincing Professor Huxley of the historical, supernatural character of New Testament religion, he would not necessarily have brought him any nearer the kingdom of heaven than he found him. Such is the immense difference between believing Jesus and believing in Jesus.

AMERICAN CHURCHMANSHIP AND CHURCH UNITY.

From *The Living Church* (Episcopalian), Chicago, Jan. 18, 1890.

In a former article we have shown what is meant by the special claims of the Episcopal Church, and why, in making overtures towards unity, she has been obliged to reserve and insist upon certain fundamental points. We have seen that from her own point of view this position is not a matter of her own choosing, but grows necessarily out of her organization and nature. She finds herself in possession of an organization with a fixed character which has descended to her from the holy Apostles, with certain unchangeable features, and an unvarying method of transmission. This organization includes also an unchangeable Faith and certain institutions, which it is her duty to preserve to the end of time.

The question between the Episcopal Church and the Christian denominations is not so much concerned with this or that mode of Church government, episcopal or other; but the real question to be determined is this, whether or not Christ and His Apostles founded an organization to exist visibly in the world, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, which is destined to continue until the end of all things, and which, therefore, has been clothed with the power of self-perpetuation. If this question be answered in the affirmative, then it is a mere truism that such a Church is a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, and that it hath "authority" in matters of faith. Moreover, from the divine character of such a body, the permanent institutions which it preserves and celebrates derive a force and authority which no mere recent arrangements in imitation of the letter of Holy Scripture could ever claim without some sign from heaven.

But if it be insisted that no such visible organization was established by Christ or those who acted under His commission, it follows irresistibly that none exists now. There is then no organization calling itself a Church which can claim the allegiance of men. None can assume any such authority unless it has been received from above. Nor will a union of all existing denominations advance this matter one step. If no one of the present divisions of Christianity has any divine claim upon the allegiance of men, if none possesses those essentials of which we have spoken, then the union or fusion of them all cannot create an authority which did not exist before. No human arrangement can establish a divine right.

There may, of course, be very strong reasons why men who have at heart the extension of the moral and spiritual teachings of the Gospel and the perpetual memory of the Life and Passion of Christ should join such a body; but if it seem to any man or set of men that they can do the same thing better apart from such a body, they cannot be condemned. It is a human, not a divine institution, which invites them, and therefore it cannot speak with authority. To give up the principle of authority is not to abolish the sect spirit but to encourage it. A union based upon sentimental and utilitarian grounds can only appeal to men upon those grounds. It must set forth its merits and its advantages, but it can urge no higher claim. The very principles upon which it is based compel it to dwell upon its own merits and virtues, its economy, its missionary enterprise and efficiency, its brotherly love and charity, its devotion—a state of things which tends inevitably to hypocrisy and Pharisaism.

The spirit of the Church which rests upon divine institution is the opposite of this. While it is made up of weak and erring men, the very fact that they have so wonderful and precious a trust laid upon them, must needs make their own incapacity more glaring, and deepen the sense of humility in all thoughtful minds. They will not feel inclined to make prominent and glory in those features of the visible Church which are merely of man's contriving—missionary boards, guilds, brotherhoods and sisterhoods, missions, retreats, and the like. The constant vigilance necessary to render these agencies efficient and to prevent them from degenerating into a positive abuse or injury to the cause they are meant to aid, is too sadly apparent to all who have had even a brief experience. But they will feel bold to appeal to that which was not the work of men's hands, to that which they have not created but received, to the Church of the living God, "the pillar and ground of the truth."

It is here, therefore, that the real importance of those fundamental points upon which the bishops, in their now famous declaration, have taken their stand, becomes apparent. They have not retained in their irenicon one single point which it was possible for them to give up. The things which we insist upon, they would say, are not ours, they are a sacred trust, the essentials of the Gospel of Christ as we have received it. To all who would persuade them to yield anything here, they are forced to say: *Non possumus.*

The intelligent reader will readily see that it is in no self-righteous or arrogant spirit that this Church has proposed its terms of union; on the contrary, the attitude of the bishops is one of the loftiest charity.

In any united "Church of the Future," unless there is some basis of divine authority, the union can in the nature of things be only transitory and must in the end be futile. It must be able to claim the allegiance of men, to speak with the voice of authority, as the representative of Christ on earth, or it will inspire no real respect and have no lasting mission in the world. At this juncture the bishops by their declaration have made clear to the Christian world the difficulty which lies in the way of all human schemes of reunion, and have pointed out the only way to true and lasting unity. It is not, therefore, the pre-eminence of the Episcopal Church on its human side, which is at stake, but the effective character of the united body, and its power to call upon men with an authoritative voice.

CHRIST, THE BREAD OF LIFE.

BY REV. JOHN M'DOWELL LEAVITT, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Episcopal Recorder* (Reformed Episcopalian), Philadelphia, Dec. 26, 1889.

How strange the history of a loaf of bread! The soft, white flour comes from a seed torn by plough and harrow. Even before the green leaf rose above the earth, its germ was exposed to the claws and beaks of birds, to be blighted by frost and swept by flood. When the harvest was ripe, iron reaped the yellow grain, and iron too threshed it. Mill-stones ground it into powder. Bitter leaven mingles with the flour, which feels the fire before it reaches the table.

Now the bread enters the body of man, and flowing through his blood, nourishes this strange human growth. Invisible particles are incorporated with bone and sinew and muscle. They become portions of the very heart, as it pulsates them through the system. By minute tubes they are borne to the tips of the fingers, and of the hair. They minister to the brain, supplying those delicate and mysterious organs which are connected with the soul, and which are thus related to passion, to will, to thought, to moral agency, and all the sublime possibilities of man's everlasting future. Bread feeds the hunger of the world, bread feeds the heart of the world, bread feeds the brain of the world. In this pilgrimage of earth, bread helps us to heaven.

Jesus, too, from manger to cross was torn, was bruised, was broken. The star of Bethlehem shone over a lowly birthplace, to toil and poverty and a cross. Our Saviour through all His mission was ploughed and harrowed by hate. Like birds of prey, men and demons sought His destruction. He resembled the seed cut with iron, ground by stone, exposed to fire. But by this very process, He became for man the bread of everlasting life. Only by allying itself to our mortal human flesh could Godhead appease our immortal human hunger. Whosoever feeds by faith on Him is satisfied for time and eternity. He meets every want in a soul. Meat, indeed, His flesh! drink, indeed, His blood! These symbols transport us to the heart of redemption and experience. The centre of all doctrine and of all piety is that faith in the death of Jesus—our Incarnate God and Creator—which seals to us the forgiveness of our sins, brings to us the regeneration of our souls, and assures us of the life everlasting.

How beautiful the lesson taught by the multiplication of the loaves! Jesus left the shore of Galilee, and ascended a mountain, perhaps in view of the exquisite lake. The multitude follow. See men and women and children sitting together on the green grass! Jesus does not despise their human hunger. He converts it into an immortal lesson. Under His Divine touch, one of our lowest animalistic wants becomes a teacher forever. Five loaves by His omnipotence are multiplied to feed five thousand. And there is a generous remainder of baskets of fragments! Touching and exquisite picture of Jesus as the infinite and exhaustless satisfaction of man's spiritual hunger! By the anticipation of faith, patriarchs and prophets lived on Him. Apostles and martyrs lived on Him. Millions since have lived on Him. Down to the end of time innumerable multitudes will live on Him. And He will be their feast forever! Through the eternal years of heaven, Jesus will be the everlasting banquet of His redeemed.

There is a deep meaning in that promise to the Christians at Pergamos, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the *hidden* manna." We are transported back through centuries to the wilderness. What sparkles like frost over the earth? Have the dews been congealed into those glittering crystals? No! It is the bread Jehovah sends from heaven during forty years to Israel. Moses deposits a portion within the vail, in the ark, next the law, beneath the mercy seat, covered by the wings of the cherubim, and the cloud of the Divine glory. This is the "*hidden*" manna. It was made directly by Jehovah, and preserved in the holiest by His command.

Our daily bread is the symbol of Jesus as He supports our daily life, and is the food of our earthly pilgrimage. But beyond the vail of death, on the throne of the temple of the universe, He is as yet to us the "*hidden*" manna. Hereafter in heaven He will be the everlasting bread, reserved for us, His celestial and immortal guests.

CHILDREN FOR LEADERS.

From *The St. Louis Christian Advocate* (Methodist), Dec. 25, 1889.

It is notorious that the young people in many places are giving direction and tone to the church life; their societies, their leadership are conspicuous. Is this best? Can children be leaders? Is the spirit engendered by young life, the spirit of sobriety, of reverence? Can there be solidity in such direction? The pastor makes a sad mistake who does not use his utmost care to save the young; the mistake is scarcely less serious and more far-reaching to turn the reins of control over to the young. The element of humility and obedience are not in leadership, but in following. The young are to be trained under the direction of those who, by reason of their age and training, have been schooled in the sober virtues of spiritual leadership.

The spirit native to young folks is not the spirit that should form church sentiment or challenge church leadership. Let the young be led by the training hand of age, and experience, and wisdom.

Rehoboam made no more fatal mistake when he rejected the counsels of the old and tried leaders of his father, for the spirit and freshness of young counsel, than the church does in making the young their leaders. Reverence is not in young hearts; experience, maturity, wisdom are not there. The prophesied woful day to Israel would be when women and children were their leaders.

THE WEAK POINT IN A GREAT WORK.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, Jan. 9, 1890.

An Episcopal rector in Brooklyn has recently taken the radical step of abolishing the Sunday-school in his church. He claims that the Episcopal church never intended to have any Sunday-schools. Personally he believes they are mischievous on account of the incompetency and ignorance of many teachers. He compares the religious instruction of children in such schools to the care of a valuable horse by a person not thoroughly versed in stable duties, and deplores the injustice to which the children's souls are thus subjected. To take the place and to avoid the evils of Sunday-schools he conducts himself a catechism class every Sunday afternoon for both children and adults.

Mr. Ruskin somewhere speaks of the danger of taking from the strength of strong things by saying them too strongly. The Brooklyn rector has certainly fallen into this error in his criticism of the Sunday-school. He forgets or ignores the immense good which has been done by Sunday schools. He takes no account of their social force. He makes nothing of the opportunities they give for personal religious influence. He overstates the defects he has seen in them, and can find no remedy but dispensing with them altogether. It is not surprising that this action has alienated several of the more active members of his church. In spite of his opposition, Sunday-school classes continue to gather in the homes of teachers to whom they have become attached, and it is likely soon to become a question whether the rector or the Sunday-school shall "go."

Notwithstanding the extravagance and folly of a step like this, there is enough of truth in the charge which was made to justify it to deserve thoughtful attention. The most earnest supporters of the Sunday-school feel most strongly that its weak point is the difficulty of having capable teachers. We remember hearing an eloquent speaker at a convention descant in glowing terms upon the ideal perfection of Bible study and expository preaching as seen in a Sunday-school class, where scholars are grouped about a teacher and each can be individually guided. Alas! the system fails to fulfil the ideal because the ideal teacher is lacking. A pastor lately had occasion to take a class that had been taught for years by a leading man in his church. He found them without knowledge of the simplest Bible facts. They had never heard of any Joseph but the husband of Mary. Their religious ideas were generally nebulous in the extreme. This was by no means an exceptional case. It could be paralleled in most Sunday-schools.

The trouble is not easy to deal with. Volunteer teachers cannot be criticised and held to their work as salaried teachers are in other schools. The most incompetent are the most self-complacent. It is the experience of pastors and superintendents who have carried on teachers' meetings that the teachers in greatest need of training could seldom be induced to attend. Some Sunday-school specialists have gone so far as to advocate hiring teachers. We do not believe the problem can be solved in that way. But when we consider that the Sunday-school supplies all the religious instruction received nowadays by a large part of the children of Protestant families, nothing is more important than to secure its highest efficiency.

THE DISCOURAGING BROTHER.

From *The Central Baptist*, St. Louis, Jan. 9, 1890.

There is one office it is no honor to fill. The one who fills it most completely is least deserving of honor. We refer to the office of religious brakeman, habitual discourager, general depressing agent and enemy of sanctified enthusiasm. It is commonly supposed that success and happiness in Christian service depend on hopefulness, cheerfulness and good spirits. This frame of mind has been found most friendly to every good undertaking and on good terms with hard work. Good-natured, buoyant souls are never around candidating for the position of brakeman, but aspire to a place near the engine and in partnership with the source of power.

But there are a few, and we are glad they are but few, who find it more agreeable to their nature to put a check on the fervor of their brethren. They stand with willing hands on the brake, ready at the first appearance of quickened speed to give the wheel a few vigorous turns to hold things back from too rapid progress. They are afraid affairs will run off. They are in mental dread of a wreck. They are set for a defence against down grades. Everything seems to them to be heading towards a precipice, and on them alone is laid the power or wisdom to avert impending ruin. It can be said of some of them that they are faithful to their assumed responsibilities.

This office does not demand a very high order of talents in its incumbents. It is filled by the humbler class of talents. Indeed too much mental capacity and largeness of ideas are seriously in the way of effectiveness. A little bit of skill added to a strong disposition in that direction is sufficient. One who could not hope for distinction in any other calling has been known to amount to a positive and successful paralyzer to a whole church in some good work. This icy brother is not heard for his eloquence or felt for his much power; it is his low temperature that does the work. The modern scheme of making ice under a tropical sun is but a poor imitation of the brother we are describing. He is the original, genuine patent; all others are base imitations.

The prayer-meeting furnishes a fine field for this restrainer of feeling. Just as the brethren are beginning to grow ardent over the full attendance and the promptness of those who take part, it is his opportunity to suggest in a long metre speech that it is a sad comment on our religion that not half of the members are present, and that comparatively few of those present give evidence of intelligent faith. He soon reduces the temperature from boiling to freezing. You see there are so many weak places in the ordinary church that he can make every stroke tell. There are so many openings that the chilling winds soon fill the place. He is a success. He kills the next prayer-meeting by killing this.

When the revival season is at hand and there is a quickened religious feeling prevalent, our brother magnifies his office. He preaches that excitement is the great foe of genuine conversion, and that as serious and reasonable a matter as religion ought to be entered upon deliberately, coolly, intelligently. Unfortunately he can illustrate his theory by many a conspicuous example of noisy professions terminating in a falling off into violent unbelief. He favors a quiet work of grace. He has studied his speech a year, and gets it off at a time when its cooling effect will be most felt.

If the subject is that of missions to any particular locality or people, and if it is calling out a blaze of interest, it is very easy for him to divert attention to some other field and break up the intensity of interest. Why pray and give for the conversion of China while there are several hundred people in hearing of the church who are not converted! Why send money away for any object of benevolence while the church finds it hard to raise money for its own expenses! It is a doubtful benevolence to aid in the education of ministers while there are examples of beneficiaries who never amounted to anything, and of self-educated men who rose to highest distinction. Just a few facts like these and a small lump of ice upon them will do the work for any warm interest in ministerial education.

If a neighboring mission appeals for help, somebody can speak truthfully and say that it is not wisely located, or that it has not been well managed, or that another church ought to provide for its support. You may depend on our skilled reducer of temperature to come in at the right time with a few objections that he keeps on hand, and when he gets through he has turned the tropics into winter. The stream of benevolence freezes at higher temperature than any other stream in this climate.

The brakeman is not a bad man to have aboard the train. We feel safer to know that he is along and that he understands the signals. But you don't want him to go ahead to the locomotive, cut off steam and shut the whole train down. We need him at the steep down grades and at the stations. It is a saving of time to have his services. But if he is forever twisting that old wheel and fighting the engineer and causing the train to fall behind the time table, he is a positive detriment.

We like the cautious, cool brother, who keeps us supplied with ice, but we do not want ice in the furnace and everywhere else. In religion we like to see a good degree of heat.

CURING THE FAITH CURE.

From *The Christian Union*, New York, Jan. 1, 1890.

We have small sympathy with what is known as the Faith Cure. The essential principle of the faith cure is, Use no medicine yourself, but trust in God to heal you. We believe that this is bad theology in the spiritual world and bad medicine in the material world—no better in the one than in the other. Faith in God is best shown by using the means which he has put in our power and then trusting in him. Cromwell's motto is the best embodiment of faith —"Trust in God and keep your powder dry." We have, therefore, no defence to make for those fanatics who refuse to take medicine themselves or give it to their children, and expect that God will miraculously heal them in answer to prayer.

But we gravely doubt the wisdom, not to say the rightfulness, of arresting and imprisoning such fanatics. If, indeed, society finds sick children neglected by their parents, for whatever reason or with whatever excuse, it may take the children from the neglecting parents and provide for them itself. That right we do not question—nay, we vigorously affirm. But the right of society to punish a man for not taking the right kind of medicine, or not taking any medicine at all, or for refusing to give it to his wife or his child, is another matter. If society may determine that prayer will not heal, and punish a man for administering prayer, why may it not determine that allopathic remedies will not heal, and punish him for administering allopathic remedies? The individual has some rights which the majority are bound to respect. To attempt to compel a man to pursue the course of healing which the majority think right is carrying sumptuary legislation beyond the bounds to which it was ever carried by Puritan or Hebrew. We doubt whether its parallel is to be found even in the legislation of the French Revolution. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of more than the church. If we want to feed the fires of fanaticism, we can scarcely invent a better way than by putting half a dozen faith-curists in prison for not giving their wives and children the medical treatment which is common in the community. If some people die for want of drugs, a great many die because of them. If society will take precautionary measures to protect children from the ignorance or the religious enthusiasm of their parents or guardians, it will carry protective measures as far as it can carry them with safety or advantage. In the long run the best way to correct the errors of the faith-curists is to let them try the faith cure and suffer the consequences.

GOLDEN RULE LEGENDS.

ST. BRIGHTSIDES.

A Story of the Influenza Epidemic of 1841.

From *The Golden Rule*, Boston, Jan. 8, 1890.

St. Brightsides had the grippe; there was no doubt about it. The intolerable headache, the backache, the smarting eyes, the cold chills, the consumptive-like cough, all combined to make it plain to the mind of the wife of St. Brightsides that her husband had the genuine influenza from the far East. "Now," said his consort to herself, "if all accounts are true, I shall hear plenty of fretful and lugubrious wails from this usually cheerful spouse of mine, for they say that even a saint can't help complaining when this disease tortures him. When he had the typhoid-fever, to be sure, he found comfort in the fact that it wasn't the small-pox; and when he broke his arm he found real joy in the recollection that it was his left and not his right arm that was broken; and when all four of the children had the measles at the same time he found wonderful satisfaction in the thought that they did not have the diphtheria. But people do say that, while it lasts, nothing else so prompts to suicide as the grippe. I wonder how he will comfort himself now." Thus soliloquized the wife of St. Brightsides as she bustled about, getting him some beef tea and a hot-water bottle for his feet, and other creature comforts. "If he is like himself, however, he'll be sure to have something cheerful to say," she added.

And, sure enough, as she opened his door, though he was wrestling at the time in the grip of his morning headache, he cried out, "How fortunate it is, Martha, my dear, that this pestilence comes only once in about forty years! I'm fifty years old now, and hardly likely to live to see another epidemic."

"Just as I said!" said the wife of St. Brightsides to herself, and at once she recorded her husband's bit of optimistic philosophy for the benefit of those who might have the grippe in the pestilence of 1889–90. But alas ! St. Brightsides is long since dead, and it is said that no victim in the present generation has found anything hopeful about La Grippe upon which even the shortest legend could be hung.

CLOSING UP ACCOUNTS.

From *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), Boston, Dec. 26, 1889.

In a little town in the southern part of New York State there lives a wise man who rules a community of about nine hundred souls. He dwells with his "boys" in a big stone castle-like structure on the top of a steep hill. In many respects, he is a remarkably stern man ; and, when his jaws meet, as they do with a clash sometimes, everybody recognizes a determination as immovable as the granite of ages. His "boys" are young fellows sent to him to be taught obedience to law and better methods of living. On occasions like Thanksgiving Day and Christmas, this wise man has a habit of saying to his most promising children :

"Well, boys, some of you have done well, and some of you haven't done so well. But let us square up accounts, and throw away the bad memories of the past ; and let us start all over again."

"Let us start all over again !" The absolute justice of such a proceeding is not something to be argued on strict logical principles, but the wisdom of it is something that has been demonstrated many a time during the past ten years. Little bad boys in school and big worse boys out of school all know how dreary the prospect becomes when one gets saddled with long accumulations of derelict accounts. The days pass by quickly, and each day leaves its little heap of mental and moral debt. By and by, the load assumes mountainous proportions, and the mere contemplation of it produces a sickening sense of the futility of regenerative effort. This wise man has discovered that nothing serves so well to encourage the anxious and fretting struggles as a relief—even if it be almost entirely hypothetical, as relief from the results of one's own wrong-doing always must be—from the galling pack of borrowed and accumulated iniquities.

Nobody ever escaped the effects of wrongdoing in this world. The immutable law of Nature and of Nature's God doesn't permit the transference and relinquishment of moral debt. This is a fact that cannot be disguised. But the attitude which the creditor assumes is everything. May not the wise Father frequently take somewhat the stand of the indulgent creditor who says : "Of course, your debt is possible of enforcement by legal means. You owe me so much ; and you know and I know that you've got to pay it—now or some other time. I can do one of two things : I can grind this debt out of you by systematic torture, or I can make the debt one of honor, and say : 'Let us be friends. You owe me so much—let that matter drop just now. Go about your business. Start all over again. I can't relieve you of your debt, but I can relieve you of anxiety about it. I won't bother you any more. Pay me when you can'" ?

This is a very material way of looking at things, and the simile may not strike everybody as the most reverent. Indeed, commercial analogies as applied to God's dealings have been altogether overdone. But the analogy in actual life exists just the same. The wise man in New York says, "Boys, let us start all over again." He does not relieve the young men of the evil fruits of their past transgressions. He does not wipe away any of the stains of misspent life. Nobody can do that but the young men themselves. He simply changes his base ; he alters his attitude toward the young sinners. The Father of us all says, "Children, let us close up accounts, and start all over again." He does not relieve us of the effects that still continue of our folly in the past. We are not freed from a debt that must be paid, a debt that we have contracted and must honor. He changes his attitude from that of creditor to that of Friend. Christian's pack still clings to him ; but, oh, how much lighter it grows when he catches a glimpse of the kindly beams that welcome him to higher endeavor !

WHY SOME PREACHERS FAIL.

From *The Religious Telescope* (United Brethren), Dayton, O., Jan. 15, 1890.

That many preachers do not succeed as they desire is very true. In fact, the most efficient pastors often feel that they do but very little compared with what they would like to do. In so far as this feeling is born of humility and a burdening sense of the many who are yet unsaved, it is not to be deplored. When we are weak in our own eyes and in our own strength, and so realize our weakness as that it drives us to God, then are we strong.

Many do not succeed for lack of qualification, others for lack of zeal, others again because they "have too many irons in the fire,"—preach, farm, work as agents, etc. The minister to be truly successful must give his mind, his time, his physical energies to the work. Only in this way can he become so acquainted with the people, the situation, and so skilled in the handling of the truth as to effectually apply it to the immediate emergencies.

But there is one cause of failure not named above to which we would call attention. It is a species of self-reliance, prompted by vanity and egotism. We do not pretend to say, that there are many such preachers, but there are at least a few. They have good natural abilities, fine *physique,* have at least a smattering of an education, an easy flow of words, are eloquent and somewhat sensational in speech, and have been told that they are fine pulpit orators. Thus assured, they rely on themselves, and in their pulpit efforts are chiefly interested in displaying their abilities and in producing a fine effect by the exercise of their oratorical powers, and leave Christ away in the background. The result is, the glorification of self at the expense of Christ; and although the people are entranced and laud the orator, conviction is not carried to the hearts of sinners by a plain presentation of Christ and the terrors of the law, the church is not edified, and souls are not saved.

How utterly cold and lifeless is such preaching compared with the plain, blunt, burning words of a Moody or a Spurgeon! With them there is no attempt at oratorical display (and yet they are the most truly eloquent of all orators, for the true orator is the speaker who carries his point), only a plain, earnest presentation of truth, such as edifies saints and causes sinners to tremble.

We knew one of those popular pulpit orators once. He drew large audiences, and his eloquence was the theme of many a conversation. It so happened, many years ago, that his conference assigned him to an important charge in a city. After being there more than a year, he became disheartened because the work did not go. The church was not built up—souls were not saved. One day on meeting a man of great bluntness of speech and of just as great practical common sense, he said, "Brother E., I wish to ask you a question. When I came to this charge I resolved that I would do better work than ever. I laid aside all my old sermons and prepared new ones. I have studied hard, worked hard, preached better sermons than ever before, and still the work don't go. Now can you tell me why?"

"Do you wish me to tell you?" said Mr. E.

"Of course I do."

"Well, I can do it. It is just this way. You go into your study, work hard, get up fine sermons (you know you can do it), and go into the pulpit and display your eloquence. And Jesus Christ says, 'O Mr. K., you can do that so fine, you don't need my assistance' (He says that, because that's the way you feel); 'you just go ahead yourself.' And you do go ahead, and the trouble is, it is all K. and no Jesus Christ. Put Jesus Christ first in your sermons and let K. be His humble servant, and then you'll succeed."

This was a blunt way of telling it; but never was a nail hit more squarely on the head. It expressed the sense exactly.

My dear brethren in the ministry, remember that only in so far as your sermons exhibit the crucified One and His truth to the people, only in so far may you expect to be instruments in His hands in saving sinners. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." It is the Son of God, lifted up in the pulpits, not eloquence, that saves sinners.

THE SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS.

From *The Moravian*, Bethlehem, Pa., Jan. 1, 1890.

Cheap sneers at "blue laws" and so forth are among the most unfortunate signs of the materialistic prosperity of our country, now that we have entered upon the closing decade of the nineteenth century. Whilst there may have been certain applications of the principles which actuated the Puritans, that are no longer adapted to the conditions of our changed life to-day, a grateful posterity ought to reverence the purpose which governed those grand men of the past, and to jealousy preserve all that was essential in their mode of thought and method of approaching national and municipal problems. Their indomitable devotion to right can never become antiquated; and their steadfast adherence to what they believed to be the will of God above and before the grasping of opportunities for sordid gain, is something we of to-day could well afford to have more of. We need to incorporate more of their spirit into our use of the modern external conveniences and comforts, and more of their sense of accountability to the Divine Ruler in our practical politics. At the recent meeting of the Congregational Club, at Boston, Mass., to commemorate "Forefathers' Day," Dr. Richard S. Storrs held up the character of the Puritans, the results of whose fidelity to principle we now enjoy in the solid prosperity of our land, in words which may well be repeated and remembered. Said he:

"The Puritan had an intense conviction of what is apprehended as truth, but also an intense sense of the authority of righteousness as constituting the imperative law of mankind. Added to this was the assurance of a personal power at the head of the universe, who is working for righteousness and means to make it triumphant in the world, together with a profound sense of the invisible world as the immortal realm of righteousness. Puritanism has its sources and its securities in the sovereign elements of human nature, in the discerning and imperative conscience which affirms right as the ultimate law in the universe of mind, in the intuitive reason which declares the certitude of invisible truth, in that divine side of the soul which is in direct correspondence with its author and which sees the eternal justice and might on the field of human combat more clearly than in the earthquake or in any far-shining figures of the stars. We want not to eulogize their spirit, but to incorporate it into our personal life; not to put it away from us as something which belongs to the past, but to set it forth anew amid our modern conditions."

THE VIRGIN MOTHER.

From *The Moravian*, Bethlehem, Pa., Dec. 25, 1889.

"Blessed art thou among women!" was the salutation given to Mary by Gabriel. And surely no one that lives in a Christian land and notes the homage paid to Mary, as the mother of Jesus, can doubt for a moment the fulfilment of Gabriel's prophecy.

Though as Protestants we differ widely and radically from Romanists with regard to the real position of Mary, her powers and prerogatives, yet all Christendom unites in believing that Mary was the holiest woman that ever lived. We have, perhaps, idolized her. Realism, that has robbed us of much we loved in art and literature, would doubtless also clothe Mary with a different face and expression than those with which they who love and revere her memory have adorned her. But idealism is sometimes truer than realism. Munkacsy's Christ, in his "Christ before Pilate," is a realist's conception. No idealist will ever be satisfied with that picture. Nor can we be satisfied to rank Mary as merely an ordinary Hebrew woman—as some would have us believe. While we cannot, of course, in any way endorse Romish views and superstitions, yet there is something so appealing to human sympathy, so gracious and benignant in the figure and history of Mary, that we cannot but place her on a higher level than that occupied by any other woman.

She was not only virtuous. Doubtless the great majority of Jewish maidens were pure. But she must have been pre-eminently pious. She must have been one of those who looked for the consolation of Israel. She must have been—as far as it is possible for mortal to be—holy in soul and body.

In the strong revulsion of sentiment accompanying the German Reformation it is possible that we Protestants have gone too far in denying homage to the Mother of our Lord.

We do not maintain that divine honors should be paid her: far be it from us to voice such a sentiment! But do we fully appreciate the beauty and holiness of her character? Do we give her the honors that she deserves as the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ? In many Protestant Churches more honor has been paid to the mothers of kings and presidents than to the mother of the God-man.

Mary is the chief among women. No woman in history, however great and pure and noble, deserves to be ranked with her. She alone was accounted worthy to bear the Saviour of our race. The tremendous responsibilities that rested on her, as the mother of Him who should save His people from their sins, were duly realized by her. Was she not told that a sword should pierce through her heart?

May we not believe that Mary was more to our Lord than merely the woman that bare Him? He seems to have loved and revered her. "Son, behold thy mother," was His last commission to His dearest earthly friend, when He bequeathed Mary to John's care.

May we not in this Christmas season lay some sweet garlands at her feet who gave all she was and had to the Saviour of our souls? Will it not be acceptable to her Son, our Saviour, if in our Christmas joys we forget not to honor her that bare Him?

THE VALUE OF THE STUDY OF THE CHURCH FATHERS.

BY THE REV. GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, Jan. 18, 1890.

A NUMBER of books have recently been published, dealing, in a more or less popular way, with the lives and writings of the early Church Fathers, which seem to indicate a freshly awakened interest, among general readers, in this department of Christian literature. Farrar's "Lives of the Fathers," Hemphill's "Diatessaron of Tatian," Mrs. Martin's "Life of St. Jerome," Bigg's "Christian Platonists of Alexandria," though not all of the same quality or grade, are examples of this class of publications. With them we may connect the series of translations of the ante-Nicene Fathers, now being followed by the Nicene and post-Nicene, issued in this country by the Christian Literature Company. The reception accorded to this series of translations shows that it supplied a much-felt need of Protestant Christians. In fact, all kinds of knowledge, whether scientific, or historical, or theological, have in our day been popularized; and, not the least, biblical and religious criticism. The latter, however, has so often occasion to mention and discuss early Christian literature, that probably a greater number of persons than ever before have felt a desire to know something of the men and books whose names are so often met, and whose statements about Scripture and primitive Christianity are so often quoted in current publications.

Of course, more serious work in this department has always been carried on by certain classes of students. Not only have learned Roman Catholics devoted attention to the Fathers, but English, and, more lately, German Protestant scholars, have diligently studied and edited their writings, critically examined and corrected the text given in the manuscripts, and estimated their historical and religious value. Scholars, therefore, have always recognized the importance of this branch of study, both for its own sake and because of its bearings on other departments of theological science. It is the fact of an increased popular interest both among clergy and laity, and beyond the bounds of those churches where such an interest would most naturally be expected, which deserves attention.

The question, therefore, may properly be raised, What is the value, to the general reader, of the study of the Church Fathers? Probably not a few intelligent Protestants regard it as sheer waste of time. It was very natural for Protestantism to react so far from the false use made of the Fathers by the Roman Church as to neglect them altogether. The Fathers had been raised to the position of religious authorities. At the Reformation their opinions were quoted oftener than the Scriptures. Their teachings were practically raised above those of the apostles, and used to support utterly unscriptural dogmas. It was natural for Protestants, who maintained the sole authority of the Scriptures, to neglect, and even despise, authors who had been made to occupy so false a position.

It was easy also for Protestant writers to bring the Fathers into contempt. Many of their books had been corrupted, and the current text could be shown to be untrustworthy. Many contradictions and absurd conceits and manifest errors could be pointed out in their teaching. They could be quoted against one another on both sides of almost any theological question. In fact, the Protestant reaction against their use was absolutely necessary in order to lead at a later period to a proper estimate of their value. Jean Daillé's work "On the Right Use of the Fathers," published in French in 1631, and still often found in Protestant libraries, was one of a number which, by proving the entire insufficiency of the Fathers as authorities for the Church, prepared the way for a more discriminating and useful study of them.

So long, then, as the Church Fathers were regarded as dogmatic authorities, the study was more mischievous than beneficial. But we now approach them in a wholly different spirit. We are ready to criticise their opinions like those of other writers, to discriminate between the truth and error in their pages, to cross-examine their testimony and weigh their arguments, to discover which of the books assigned to them are genuine and which are spurious,—in short, to study them by the methods of historical criticism, and then to value them for what they may be proved to be worth. So used, the Church Fathers are of very great value to the thoughtful Christian reader. None should be content to be ignorant of men who in their lives and by their writings played important parts in the early progress of Christianity, and are now playing almost equally important parts in the modern study of the Christian origins,—a study which bears directly on the defence of the Christian faith.

To briefly indicate, then, the value of the study of the early Church Fathers, we may observe: 1. That they are the principal means of acquiring knowledge of the early history of Christianity after the apostolic age. It is not enough to know early Christianity merely from the New Testament. That, of course, is our sole authority for faith and practice; but the intelligent Christian will not want to isolate it from the Christian literature which followed it any more than from the secular environment amid which it arose. As he seeks light upon the New Testament itself from Oriental customs, from Jewish modes of thought, and from the political, social, and intellectual condition of the Roman Empire, so will he want to see how Christianity affected men's thought and conduct, how it was understood in the generations which succeeded the first, and how, as it mingled with the turbid stream of the world's life, it was itself modified by the influences which acted upon it. He knows that the theological statements and ecclesiastical forms with which he is acquainted are not, in most cases, put in precisely their present shape in the New Testament, though they may correctly convey the New Testament's teaching; and he will therefore wish to learn by what stages and under what circumstances the present forms were attained. The New Testament will be all the better appreciated by him when thus placed at the beginning of Christian history.

But it is one thing to read history, and another to study it. The latter alone gives real grasp upon the meaning of past events. One event or epoch thus grasped is worth to a man's culture a hundred about which he has merely read. To do this, however, the reader must go to the sources. He must examine the literature of the period in question. He must become well acquainted with the mental character of those who acted the chief parts in the drama. He must, so far as possible, come to know them at first hand, if he would vividly apprehend their significance and that of the events with which they were concerned.

Now, there is no easier way of doing this, for Christian history, than by the study of the Church Fathers. The perusal of their books is the quickest and best way of entering into the spirit of their times. Most of them were prominent actors in the history. Their writings disclose to us their minds and those of the Church and its opponents. We may obtain from them a distinct sense of both the good and evil which was current in the Church, of the changing phases of the long conflict between faith and unbelief, of the gradually clearer and deeper and broader understanding of the gospel which, in spite of the rise of errors, kept pace, first in the Greek churches, and then in the Latin, with the territorial widening of Christendom. Especially in the literature of the first six centuries may this study be profitably pursued; while its biographical character will give natural centers about which to group in memory the relations of each successive epoch. Let any one thus firmly grasp the life and thought, the age and situation, of any of the principal Church Fathers, and he will have acquired a more useful lesson in the history of the Church than he could acquire by the perusal of many modern volumes.

2. Furthermore, the study of the Church Fathers will impress most readers with a fresh sense of the antiquity of the gospel.

The Bible is too often in our thought isolated from its historical connection with the life of the ancient world. Being regarded as a Divine authority, the circumstances of its composition are forgotten. Believed to be a gift of God to all mankind, the actual way in which it was given appears of slight importance, and passes from our thought. This is less the case now than formerly, but the remark is still true of many of its readers. Hence the fresh confidence which is felt when, for example, archæology unearths an ancient monument which attests the truthfulness of the scriptural narrative, or when the historian cites a secular witness to the existence and character of the early Christians.

Now much the same impression will be given to most readers of the Church Fathers. True, their works will often appear tedious and verbose. They frequently deal at great length with controversies of which not even the echoes now survive. But the reader will recognize in their pages the same religion which he himself professes. He will find them accepting the same facts of Christ's life which the Gospels record, commending usually the same cardinal duties and discussing the same fundamental doctrines. He may often think their arguments more ingenious than convincing, and may detect dangerous elements in their teaching; but as he meets these living monuments of ancient Christianity, and observes their unquestionable testimony to the historicity of the Gospel, he will usually obtain renewed confidence in it for himself. He will see against what a mighty stream of testimony unbelief has to contend, and will be convinced anew that the origin of Christianity is correctly described in the New Testament.

Bishop Lightfoot, if I remember correctly, has remarked, in one of his celebrated essays in answer to the book called "Supernatural Religion," that, if the modern inquirer would carefully read the work of Irenæus again Heresies, he would be better armed against the attacks of sceptical criticism than he would be by the study of all the German literature which has been issued upon the subject. Even Daillé, though living in the thick of the conflict with Romanism, and though his book was written to disprove the use then made of the Fathers, could not conclude without acknowledging this effect of their works when properly employed. "In this particular," he says, "their authority may be of good use to you, and may serve as a probable argument of the truth. For is it not a wonderful thing to see that so many great wits, born in so many several ages, during the space of fifteen hundred years, and in so many several countries, being also of such different tempers, and who in other things were of such contrary opinions, should, notwithstanding, be found all of them to agree so constantly and unanimously in the fundamentals of Christianity; that, amidst such great diversity of worship, they should all adore one and the same Christ; preach one and the same sanctification; hope, all of them, for one and the same immortality; acknowledge, all of them, the same Gospels; find therein, all of them, great and high mysteries?"

3. Still again, the perusal of the Fathers will have often the practical value of showing the antiquity of so-called "modern" unbelief. The reader will find that Christianity has had to contend with substantially the same foes all along her history. Sometimes even in form will the unbelief of antiquity be found identical with that met now. In other cases, old foes will be recognized under new faces. The thoughtful reader will detect, under the terms of ancient controversies, the same principles which are involved in those of recent date. He cannot, for example, examine Origen's work against Celsus without being surprised, on the one hand, at the intelligence and vigor with which, in the latter half of the second century, philosophy attacked the new religion which had at last forced itself on the unwilling notice of pagan culture, and, on the other hand, at the intelligence and vigor with which Christianity was defended. He will feel that the intellectual triumph of the new religion was as notable as at a later period was its civil and social victory.

Even in the absurd conceits of the Gnostics, against which some of the Fathers argue at great length, he will recognize the familiar battle between a transcendental philosophy and sober faith in historical Christianity, while only those who condemn all theology will fail to admire the books in which the Fathers contended, with much subtlety, no doubt, and often with unhappy rancor, but also with keen ability and thorough acquaintance with Scripture, against the effort of heresy to corrupt the faith once delivered to the saints. Gibbon relates, with a scarcely concealed sneer, the violent debates of the Nicene writers about an "iota,"—whether, that is, the Son is "homoousios" or "homoiousios" to the Father; but the smile vanishes from our lips when we remember the real significance of that iota, and when we recall more recent attacks upon the deity of Christ. It will, in fact, be of no little value, if, by reading the Fathers, some of the glamour which has been attached to the word "modern" be rubbed off, and if we realize the antiquity of unbelief in nearly all its present forms, as well as the antiquity of the truth.

4. To these considerations I may add the final remark that the study of the Fathers will give the reader a clearer idea of the variety of the types of mind to which Christianity has from the beginning appealed, and which it has enlisted in its service. As we pass in review the practical exhortations of Clement of Rome, the overheated enthusiasm of Ignatius, the rugged honesty and boldness of Justin's apology, the elaborate treatise of Irenæus, the fierce invective of Tertullian, the philosophical acumen of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen, the ecclesiastical generalship of Cyprian, the indignant pleas of Athanasius, the profound theology and the humble piety of Augustine, the scholarship of Jerome, and the eloquence of Chrysostom, we must perceive how wide was the area of thought and life covered by their religion. Theirs is shown to have been, in the best sense, a catholic faith, for it absorbed into its service the whole energy of the human mind. Viewed in this way, the Church Fathers present to the reader shining illustrations of the broad scope and universal adaptation to humanity of the Christian faith.

These observations are, of course, intended for the general reader. To advanced students the value of the Fathers for the history of the canon of Scripture, for the text of the New Testament, and for the history of doctrine, is still greater. But they are worthy also of the acquaintance of every intelligent Christian. They should be read in critically edited, carefully made translations. Many of them need be merely tasted. Others should be thoroughly studied. They should be neither indiscriminately admired nor neglected. But they have an important place in all broad and thorough Christian culture, and the indications which we have noticed of a revived interest in their writings seems to promise a better appreciation, by the public, of men whose fate it has so often been to be either unhappily canonized or ignorantly condemned.

THE BERNARDINES.

How they Live—in Silence and Austerity, but Happy Withal.

From *The Catholic News*, New York, Jan. 12, 1890.

"Every day, as noon strikes from the clock-tower of the little church of Notre Dame de Refuge at Anglet, a sand-bound village near Bayonne, France, there files forth from the porch a notable procession. It is readily perceived that it is composed of women; but whatever may be beautiful or graceful in this womankind is carefully hidden. Each figure is clothed in a coarse white flannel skirt with a cape, carrying at the back a large black cross. Head and face," writes Mr. Henry W. Lucy in the *English Illustrated Magazine*, "are completely enveloped in a hood of the same rough material that composes the dress. The hood pokes out in front funnel-like, so that, unless one meets the wearer directly in front, there is no opportunity of looking on her face, nor may she regard the face of her kind. Chanting in low, monotonous notes, the melancholy procession, looking neither to the right nor to the left, with heads bowed and hands crossed, shuffle along in their 'sabots,' till they reach the door of the refectory. When the last has passed in, the door closes upon them, shutting out even the temporary darkened glance of the living world they had just enjoyed. These are the nuns known as the Bernardines, a religious sisterhood founded nearly sixty years ago by l'Abbé Cestac. The peculiarity of their vow is that they voluntarily resign the privilege of speech. Except when they join in a chant or murmur their prayers, they never open their lips to speak, and through the long year they hold no converse with human being. At the beginning, the founder of this strange Order proposed to the nuns that at least once a week they should accept relief from their vow, and celebrate Sunday by indulging in conversation. But, enamoured of their new luxury, they declined the suggested amelioration of their lot, and remained silent all through the year.

"The foundations of the buildings connected with the Order were literally built upon the sand. Between the village of Anglet and the sea there lie plains of sand, with here and there a pine-tree braving the blasts from the Bay of Biscay. Half a century ago there dwelt here, housed in a straw hut, an old man who earned a pitiful living by growing a few vegetables. There was no one to dispute his territory, and little by little he scraped together a few perches of garden ground. L'Abbé Cestac found him here one day dying in the solitude of his hut. He removed him to a place of shelter, and in order to satisfy the yearnings of the dying man, he undertook to look after his carrots and turnips. L'Abbé had already started a refuge for fallen women, and it occurred to him to engage them upon the old man's pinched garden ground. Accordingly half-a-dozen women were despatched to the sand dunes, and there in solitude, with the sea on one hand and the distant village on the other, they began the work which to day has reclaimed many acres of valuable land. Where the monotonous sand heaps stood there now lies outstretched a smiling garden.

"But whilst 'les Solitaires,' as the Bernardines are called, form the most striking feature of this little colony, they are not the sole or numerically the largest section. There is a sister Order known as the 'Servantes de Marie.' These have all passed a life of purity before entering upon their novitiate. They share in the labors of the repentant women, but these can never become 'Servantes de Marie.' Between them the two classes till the soil and tend the garden. In addition there is a farm-yard and a dairy, where, as throughout the colony, all the work is done by women, with the occasional help of male laborers to grapple with the heaviest work. Everything, whether to eat or to wear, is grown or made within the borders of the colony. They are joiners, carpenters, shoemakers, bakers, and dressmakers—all women. The 'Servantes de Marie' do not confine their labors within the convent. They are ever ready to answer calls from the neighboring country, to nurse the sick, instruct the young, care for the aged, watch by the dying, and bury the dead. The largest building on the estate is the 'Pensionnat,' a vast boarding school, where over a hundred children are educated and maintained. The 'Servantes de Marie,' who have the institution in charge, provide from their own ranks professors of English, German, Spanish, and music. There is a kind of lower school, where the children of the poorer classes are educated in a manner suitable to their necessities.

"At present there are over a thousand 'Servantes de Marie,' with something like a hundred novices, the Bernardines numbering only half a hundred. The colony at Anglet is the mother of many similar institutions. The sister who showed us round—a lady whose spirit forty-six years of immuring in a convent had not subdued, and who was about as lively a little body as I met in the south of France—told me that there are over one hundred and fifty houses scattered about France—at Bayonne, Bordeaux, La Rochelle, Toulouse, Montpelier, Limoges, Arras, Cambrai, and other places. These houses comprise orphanages, hospitals, and schools. Over eight thousand children owe their instruction to the 'Servantes de Marie.' In especial manner the Sisters' mission is to women. They seek out and succor young women who are being led astray, endeavoring to place them in the way of gaining an honest living. They shelter abandoned children, and take care of the babes of poor people whilst they are out earning their daily bread. As far as I could gather, the institution is self-sustaining, having no money endowment. Everybody works, and the proceeds of the common labor furnish them with nourishment. The principal source of money income is the sale of flowers. Camellias, in particular, thrive marvellously in these reclaimed sand-hills, and bring in a substantial revenue. The dairy is another profitable workshop, the Sisters being pardonably proud of their butter.

"Summer and winter Sisters and Bernardines rise at half-past four in the morning and go to bed at nine. Within the grounds is preserved one of the cells in which the pioneer Bernardines braved the heat and the cold of the lonely sand-hills. It is nearly built of straw, with pure, white sand for flooring. A narrow bed and a tiny table, carrying an infinitesimal ewer and washhand basin, comprise the furniture of the hut. The chapel in which the Sisters met for Mass was constructed in the same neat way, with walls of straw, roof of rough red tiles, and the soft sand in which the 'sabots' sank as the nuns walked to their appointed places. Now each nun has her stone-built cell, which may or may not be more comfortable, but certainly is not so picturesque as the earlier device.

"Though engaged in common work, the Bernardines live a class apart. They have their own chapel, their own range of cells, and their own refectory. Entering the portion of the ground where their domicile is situated, the visitor is faced by the injunction: 'Priere de parler voix a basse.' This injunction extends to the 'Servantes de Marie,' who drop their voices to a whisper as they watch the ghostly line file past chanting something that might well be a dirge for the loveliness of life voluntarily abandoned for this grim solitude of death. 'They don't look very happy,' I ventured to observe to the buxom, bustling Sister who did the honors of the place. 'Mais, Monsieur!' she cried, with a look of genuine surprise, 'they are of a gayety incroyable.'

"Within the refectory the silence is from time to time broken by the voice of one of the Sisters, who reads passages from works enjoining humility and self-renunciation. Again a bell rings, and the hand uplifted to carry the meagre soup to the lips is arrested, the heads are bowed, and thoughts are concentrated on that heavenly home whither this thorny pathway, they are taught, infallibly leads. After a duly ordered interval, the scanty meal continued with more pious reflections from the reader, and another sudden interposition from the bell, with peremptory call to turn aside from the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, the lusts of the flesh, and the wiles of the devil, and think only of the world to come. Then silence reigns again over this

Party in the parlor,
All silent and all—

blessed.

THE HOWARD CENTENARY.

BY REV. R. SHINDLER.

From *The New York Observer* (Presbyterian), New York, Jan. 9, 1890.

John Howard, the philanthropist, departed this life, January 20, 1790. What changes have taken place in the interval! The London of to-day and the America of to-day are very different from the London and the America of his day. From the last decade of the eighteenth century to the last decade of the nineteenth the world has made some progress and the Church some advances. When Howard died none of the modern missionary, or Bible, or Sunday-school societies had come into being, and now the seed of the kingdom is being sown everywhere. Meanwhile, the good seed of former sowings has sprung up and grown marvellously; though alas! as has been too commonly the case from the beginning, the enemy has sown tares among the wheat, some of which are only too manifestly present now. We are speaking, not of the world in distinction from the visible Church, but of the visible Church itself. But Christ can, and will, hold his own, and the truth must prevail.

The father of the philanthropist conducted an upholsterer's business in Long Lane, Aldersgate Street, London, then, according to Stowe, "a place of note for the sale of apparel, linen, and upholsterers' goods, both second-hand and new, but chiefly for old." Before his distinguished son was born, he had secured an ample fortune, with which he retired, living first at Enfield, near London, and then in the village of Clapton, which is now within the Metropolitan area. In this latter place, it is supposed John was born, about the year 1720. He had first-rate tutors, but he did not make a scholar. Imagine the future philanthropist as a boy of thirteen. The minister of the old Independent chapel, in Stoke Newington, where the Howards attended, Rev. Mecaiah Townsend, is possibly expected to dine with the Howards to-day, and young John is dressed for the occasion. There he is in the garden, thin and spare and small for his age, with rather fragile frame. Looking into his face, we see a rather large nose, eyes sparkling and full of benevolence, and compressed lips, giving an unmistakable evidence of a strong will. The hair is cut short in front, but curled behind, and he is attired somewhat in the garb of a miniature courtier.

Schooling over, he begins an apprenticeship to Messrs. Newnham & Shipley, wholesale grocers, Warbling Street, where in olden time the Roman patricians had their villas on the banks of the Thames. He had no fondness for the grocers' warehouse, however, and no delight in ledgers and columns of figures. So, at his father's death, he purchases the cancelling of his indentures, and retires to apartments in Stoke Newington. His health was not good, but the tender nursing of Mrs. Towne, a widow, in whose house he lodged, was helpful to its restoration. His gratitude took the form of a proposal to marry her, though she was twice his age. She at first refused, but his importunity succeeded, as importunity commonly does. He was left a widower in 1755, after less than three years of happy married life, when he removed to lodgings in St. Paul's Churchyard. Two things happened here. First, his acquaintance with Dr. Samuel Stennett, minister of Little Wild Street Baptist Chapel, and author of "On Jordan's stormy banks I stand," and other hymns. Little Wild Street Chapel is now the centre of Mr. George Hatton's Christian Mission, but then a rather aristocratic congregation gathered there, and Dr. Stennett was a favorite with old George III. Mr. Howard valued his ministry, and said in a letter to the Doctor that no man ever entered more into his religious sentiments, or more happily expressed them. "I bless God for your ministry. I pray God reward you a thousand-fold." The other incident was his first visit to the Continent, when he was taken prisoner by the French, and detained in prison some months. This was a painful but a wisely ordered event. It led to what became the great work of his life. What he saw and felt entered like iron into his soul. His character inspired the authorities with such confidence, however, that he was liberated on his parole, and actually returned to England to negotiate his freedom, having given his word that if he did not succeed, he would return to the prison. All through life he was a man of strict integrity. "My word is my bond" was the principle shaping all his dealings with high and low.

Howard's prison visitation, like true charity, began at home, but it did not stop at home. The prisons of London at that time —and we cannot in this short sketch go into the provinces, much less into continental countries—were dens of infamy, of misery, of vice, and of all abominations. Corruption, oppression, cruelty, and even worse evils, were rife everywhere. Howard did not take a bird's-eye view of these things, nor rely on the testimony of officials, nor on the statements of reports, if there were any; he saw for himself. He dived into the depths of the dungeons; he stood face to face with the misery; he stripped bare the abuses and corruption, and brought all the abominations into the light of heaven and public opinion. He rested not until abuses gave place to reformation, and mercy mingled her balm with the woes of the suffering. Moreover, while exposing vice, injustice, and wrong, he sought to uplift the degraded, to brighten the darkness of the dungeon, and to make proper distinctions between the confirmed and hopeless criminal, and such as had taken only a few steps in the downward course.

The admiration in which he was held by very many for his self-denial and philanthropy may be seen in a story told by Dr. Stoughton. His London abode was for some years in Great Ormond Street, in the neighborhood of many distinguished characters. A female had made several unsuccessful attempts to gain access to the great man, but at length she succeeded. Her appearance gave him the idea that he had before him a man in woman's clothes; so he rang the bell that a servant might be with him. These precautions were needless, for he had to do with a real woman, who gazed upon him with admiring wonder, poured out a flood of compliments and then retired, declaring that now she had seen the man who of all others was the object of her admiration, she should die in peace. Mr. Howard had ten years of happy married life with his second wife, his beloved Henrietta, and he was again a widower. During some of this time he resided at Cardington, near Bedford, and either rode or walked on Sabbath days to the Bunyan meeting, Bedford, until he helped to found a new interest in another part of the town. There is a monument to his memory in the parish church of Cardington, and Bedford is about to do honor to his memory by some centenary erection; but his real monument is in no one place, city, or country, but in all the cities and countries of Europe especially. Mr. Howard was one who feared the Lord from his youth, and all through his life he maintained a growing attachment to the faith of Christ, as it appears in the teaching of the Puritans, and shines in his own life and labors. Christ was his only hope, his sacrifice and redeeming blood, his trust, his confidence, his joy. When, therefore, having left home, at the age of nearly seventy, to make researches in the East concerning the plague and remedies for it, his glorious career was finally arrested at Cherson, Russia, he was neither alarmed nor unprepared. He knew whom he believed. Writing from the Hague, a few years before, he had said in his journal: "Shout, O my soul, 'grace, grace, free, sovereign, rich and unbounded grace!' Some hope have I—what joy is in that hope!—that nothing shall separate my soul from the love of God in Christ Jesus."

Called to prescribe for a young lady ill of a fever, he took the malady, and was borne to his grave shortly after his patient. In leaving England he had said: "The way to heaven from Grand Cairo is as near as from London."

His testimony to Admiral Priestman is well worthy to be repeated, but space is too narrow. It was without fear of death, and in full and joyous hope through Christ that he departed. He chose a spot for his grave in the village of Dauphiny. "There," said he, "lay me quietly in the earth, place a sun-dial over my grave, and let me be forgotten." There sleeps his dust; but his name will never be forgotten, and in celebrating the centenary of his death we cannot do better than to glorify the grace of God in him, and then "go and do likewise."

A LETTER FROM PRESIDENT STORRS.

From *The Independent* (Congregational), New York, Jan. 9, 1890.

BROOKLYN, January 3, 1890.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDEPENDENT:

Different and perplexing statements having appeared concerning the action of the Prudential Committee of the American Board in the case of a recent application for missionary appointment, and concerning my own share in the matter, perhaps you will give me room for a statement which may help to make things plainer.

At the first meeting of the Committee to consider the case, held on Tuesday, December 3d, I was present; and having previously had a full conversation with the candidate, in company with Mr. Blatchford, I was prepared to vote for his appointment. I stated this to the Committee, and gave quite fully my reasons for it. No conclusion being reached at the time, another meeting was held on the following day, at which I was also present, again signifying my approval of the appointment.

On this day, Wednesday, I suggested, in the course of my remarks, such a form of minute as it had seemed to me possible that all members of the Committee might accept; presenting, in the first part, what appeared a fair summary of my letter of acceptance of two years ago, and closing with a vote of appointment. I did not move the adoption of this suggested minute, but read it, as I said at the time, as part of my remarks, in the hope that some one who had not previously favored the appointment might be willing to move its adoption. When the further consideration of the case was adjourned for two weeks, this written suggestion was left lying, with other memoranda, on the table. It had not been brought before the Committee by any motion.

At the adjourned meeting, on December 17th, it became apparent that the closing part of the minute, as suggested by me, appointing the candidate, would not command the necessary majority; but it was moved by another member that the first part of it be adopted, a different conclusion being appended, viz. : to postpone further consideration of the case till the candidate should have finished his Seminary course. I could not regard this conclusion as wise. My mind had not changed as to the propriety of a present appointment. I anticipated the strong excitements of feeling, on either side, which have since appeared ; and perhaps I did not clearly see the pertinence of the first part of the minute, as I had drawn it, to the different conclusion now contemplated. But when it became evident that the proposal to postpone would be carried, I was naturally anxious that in the completed minute, which others were about to adopt, it should conspicuously appear—in precise correspondence with the facts—that the candidate was *not* rejected ; that his case was only postponed, was postponed to a definite time, and was postponed on a ground outside of thoughts already expressed by him on the subject of future probation ; on the ground, that is, that according to his own statement he had not yet studied eschatology, and therefore could have reached no mature conclusions upon it. The courtesy of those who approved the vote in which I could not personally join, allowed me to retouch the form of the minute, in the interest, as I thought, of clearness and of peace ; and though I did not afterward vote for it, I did, and do, " cordially unite" with those whose view was different from mine, in greatly preferring such a limited postponement, on a ground so special, to that indefinite postponement of the case which seemed at the time the only alternative. I thought, also, that all others whose views had substantially corresponded with mine on the general issue, were at one with me in this.

This is the brief history of my personal connection with the minute which was adopted, and which you have published. In one sense it is true, as has been stated, that I wrote it, in both its parts. In another, and a true sense, it was not mine ; the first part of it being applied to a different conclusion from what I had contemplated, the last part being shaped to express as carefully and distinctly as possible the decision of others, in which decision, except as an alternative to something more distinctly opposed to my views, I could not concur.

Enough has been said about this ; but now comes another question, of really large and grave importance—the question, that is, how it was possible for me, known wherever I am known at all as a steadfast conservative in theological thinking, to desire and advocate the appointment as a missionary, under the Board, of one whose mind was certainly not clear on the ever-fresh subject of future probation? I shall be glad to have space enough allowed, partially at least, to answer this question.

I am so conservative in theology as not to have as much patience as have some others, with whom in general I closely agree, with the theory, or hypothesis, of opportunity for repentance unto life eternal, beyond the grave. It has never seemed to me an error which reached to the centres of character, as does a defective doctrine of sin, or of regeneration. It has never seemed an error casting eclipse on the holy splendor of the character of God, as does that which denies retribution for sin, or which limits Divine grace to special church channels ; or as did the old doctrine that Christ died to satisfy and release the claim of the Devil on human sinners. Indeed, I have strongly sympathized with the moral motive behind the speculation, and have recognized it as finding original incentive in compassionate aspiration. But it has seemed to me an error, nevertheless, as it now does ; and one sure to involve much practical mischief. I have never hesitated to characterize it, when occasion demanded, as in my judgment without authority in the Scripture, unhistorical —unless the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory may be thought to have some affinity with it—as out of harmony with the *consensus* of existing evangelical thought, and as a too daring attempt to add to the Gospel something which the Master had not put therein. It has seemed to me especially unfriendly to faithful, fervent and patient missionary labor ; since it appears, at least, to justify the expectation that if men do *not* hear the Gospel in this life they will have a vastly extended space for repentance in the ages beyond, under the immediate exhibition of Christ, and in utter separateness from all present temptations of the world and of the flesh. I cannot reasonably presume that any man in whose mind an expectation like this is fixed will labor with earnestness, with heroic self-sacrifice, and with long endurance, to present the Lord imperfectly here to those who, if *not* thus partially and prematurely enlightened by human agency, will see Him personally, in Divine invitation and promise, amid the hereafter.

Of course this view seems narrow and harsh to those holding the opinion ; but my business is to speak with an unreserved frankness, and to show how the matter presents itself to me—presents itself now only more distinctly than it did when, several years ago, the theory began to claim acceptance in Congregational pulpits and papers. If either of my honored associates in the Prudential Committee held this theory, as neither of them does, I could not vote to send him as a missionary, however much he might wish to go. The Board certainly was not established, and it does not exist, for the propagation of any such notion. The churches at large, contributing to the Board, do not accept it. I doubt if a dozen of the corporate members intelligently adopt it. I do not believe that any missionary society will ever be organized, or certainly will be long and effectively maintained, in which this speculation becomes a controlling practical force. I most heartily wish that every one applying for appointment to the Committee, of which I find myself unexpectedly a member, felt about the venturesome and unauthorized hypothesis precisely as I do.

But while I was sitting on the platform at Springfield two years ago, listening to the debate in which I purposely took no part, the faces of seminary students were before me, the expression of which enlightened me on some things. They were, to all appearance, precisely such students as we most need, for hard but fruitful missionary work; young, strong, earnest of spirit, and highly intelligent, but with a present expression of hesitation, doubt, almost painful perplexity, overlaying their primary expression of candor, moral enthusiasm, and loyalty to Christ. The question fronted me on the spot; it faced me afterward in every hour of the weeks which intervened between that meeting and my acceptance of the Presidency; it has never since ceased to occupy my thoughts: What should be, what must be, the attitude of the Board and of its Committee toward such young men? coming from our own households and churches, from our particular colleges and seminaries; not holding the doctrine of a future probation with any assured and final conviction, but doubting about it, feeling that perhaps it *may* be true, and with the impulsive temperament of youth, which does not look before and after, hoping that it *is* true. How should I, as President, how should all in office under the Board conscientiously bear themselves toward such young men? with whom our work may be rapidly expanded; without whom our largest plans are throttled. My first answer was given in my letter of acceptance; my last answer was given in the committee-room at Boston; and the two are identical. It is not an answer inspired or modified by considerations of what is expedient. It seems to me the only fair answer which can be given.

It is not the fault of these young men that their minds are not clear on a subject so recently emerging for discussion, and concerning which a leading professor in a leading Presbyterian seminary, speaking for his own communion, has just said that "there is great perplexity in the minds of the theologians and the ministry, as well as of the people." The responsibility is with the teachers, to whom the students are attached, in whom they confide, whose skill in teaching they daily feel, but who either fail to give clear instruction on the mysterious state to come, or give such instruction as sustains and encourages the new speculation. The impressions left on the student-mind are essentially secondary, not primary. They are lunar, not solar; the pallid reflection of what others have taught, of what has met them in lectures and reviews, not affirmative convictions, vivid and regnant in their own minds. I speak in the general, quite understanding that there have been and are distinct exceptions to the rule. Ordinarily, the immediate impressions are superficial, not likely to continue in many minds after larger experience, wider study, profounder reflection, and practical work. Certainly I have dropped many impressions left on my own mind by the excellent Dr. Woods, or by even the alert and animating Professor Stuart. Some of them are now so distant and indistinct that I hardly recall them. It is fairly to be expected that these young men, with independent inquiry, with prayer for God's guidance, and under the discipline of strenuous service, will by no means retain the comparatively confused and emotional impressions which now they may express, but will establish and co-ordinate, in harmony with the Scriptures, and under their light, their own schemes of spiritual thought.

How, then, are they to be treated now, when seeking to be sent on missionary service?

As I have said, if any decisively and deliberately maintain that beyond the grave wait ages of grace for those who have not here heard of Christ, then, so far as I am concerned, they will tarry at home, to do what good they may find to do here. I shall wish them well, and be glad to learn that the Lord has blessed them; but I would not commission one in whom I should see a possible affinity to the most intrepid and brilliant of the missionaries who have made heathendom radiant with their presence, if he thought, as in my judgment he ought consistently to think, that the heathen, provided he does *not* go to them, will in the future have vast opportunities for repentance unto life, which may be sacrificed by now listening to him. I would sooner set a man to run a race with a ten-pound shot tied to each ankle, than send a man with this fixed expectation to preach to Hottentot or Hawaiian.

But how shall those be treated who simply doubt, and do not profess to know or affirm ? whose minds in a measure reflect the teachings which they have heard, but whose impressions are still "tentative and unfixed" ?

Plainly, imperatively, according to my conception of things, they are not to be met by any abrupt and sharp-edged challenge, to the effect that "if you doubt you cannot go." I do not suppose that they ever have been thus met ; certainly they must not be, so long as I have a voice in the matter. They must not be taken, either, in groups, or in any way classified, as coming from this seminary, or that, or the other. Each case must be considered by itself, patiently, candidly, with a sincerely sympathetic endeavor to ascertain exactly the reach and the force of the admitted doubt ; an effort made largely in face to face conference, in addition, at least, to those interchanged writings which may be needed, but in which, especially on the part of the young, the expression of thought is apt to be less free and familiar, more conventional and more theoretic. In such conversation great pains should be taken to disengage feeling from conviction, a sympathetic desire from a dogmatic bias, the effect of a diffused epidemical sentiment from a personal tendency ; and the line should be sharply drawn between a thought lying loosely in the mind, and a theory which is entertained as a necessary part of a speculative scheme ; between a state of mind still in flux on the subject, and one consciously set toward predetermined conclusions. Above all, it should be found whether one is heartily ready to leave the whole matter in the hands of God, as one on which He has not spoken ; or is practically convinced that He *must* do in one way, and not otherwise, to vindicate His justice. I said two years ago that the shadings of thought, at this point, would probably be delicate and intricate in some minds. I have never seen reason to modify the forecast. But the essential moral element in the mind of a candidate can be reached ; and it must be somebody's business to do it. To get now and then a good missionary, whom we otherwise should have missed, is worth many times more than all the trouble. It cannot be done, in my judgment, by the mere presentation of creed-forms, useful as these are in many ways, and highly as I honor them. The subtler states and processes of thought in an eager, sensitive, and troubled young mind, can no more be accurately measured by such than a perfume in the air can be measured by yard-sticks.

Suppose it then to be ascertained, through frank conference, that the candidate does not positively hold the theory of opportunity for repentance beyond the grave, either as part of a speculative scheme, or as clearly sustained by the Scriptures, but is yet in a certain perplexity about it, sometimes more distinctly inclining to it, and again feeling that it has no sufficient support ; what comes next ? I should say, without doubt, to certify ourselves of his clear and firm hold on the inspiration and authority of the Scripture, on the true nature and work of Christ, on the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and on the present responsibility and condemnation of the heathen, as set forth with just and appalling emphasis in the New Testament ; and then to minister to any remaining and unreduced doubt concerning a future gracious opportunity, not principally by philosophical argument—to address which to states of tangled thought, into which feeling intimately enters, is generally like trying to heal a sore with a handspike—not even so much by selected texts of the Scripture, but by stirring afresh his missionary enthusiasm, by setting him to absorb the whole substance of the Gospel without pinning his attention to the austere problems of the future, and, as soon as possible, by putting him to work in some appropriate missionary field.

It has been, and is, my fixed conviction that, as I said two years ago, "evangelists and missionaries naturally draw nearest to the heart of the Gospel." It is only an ever-fresh illustration of the words of the Master, that if any man be steadfastly minded to do with his might the will of the Father, he shall know of the doctrine. These recent, remote, and, as I think, misleading and vain speculations, are bred in the air of metaphysical meditation, in minds which are restless until they shall have planned the Divine scheme into conformity with their ethical suggestions. Energetic personal work for Christ puts the mind in a different spiritual atmosphere ; and work among the heathen, with no fettering moral commitment to the lecture-room theory, will usually clarify, instruct and energize, more than any number of lectures could.

A candid and devoted young man so working, for the glory of Christ and for man's highest welfare, will almost certainly come to see that the unevangelized peoples are not unfortunate, merely, through deficiency of light, but are consciously guilty, sinning against the light which they have, and having more light from Christ himself, by his Spirit, than had been imagined ; that they love and cleave to their evil lusts, against whatever remonstrance of reason, of the natural conscience, of the teachings of experience, of the teachings of the wise, against the admonitions of Providence, and against the rebuke of the still small voice. He will almost certainly erelong encounter the question, from some acute sinner on whom he is vainly expending his force, "If you are convinced that chances for repentance are reserved for my people, in unlimited futures beyond the grave, why not leave us to enjoy the pleasant sins in which we delight, and of which we shall have opportunity to repent when temptations are removed, and when He of whom you speak appears, in the large by-and-by ?"

A man uncommitted to any theory, and working with the full swing of his strength in the missionary field, will understand practically, and not as a mere linguistic expert, the view which Paul had of the voluntary perverse wickedness of the world, as set forth in his tremendous indictment in the letter to the Romans ; and he will enter, I should hope, into closer sympathy with that magnificent missionary leader, who certainly wrote and wrought and suffered with no thought whatever of any probation beyond the grave. Most of all, I should hope, he will come to a more intimate fellowship with the mind of the Master ; understanding the secret of his immense urgency to have the Gospel preached *at once*, in all the world, while freshly alive to his supreme declaration that many who have not consciously seen him will come, or will not come, into his kingdom, according as they have done, or have not done, among the needy and the sick, the works of his spirit. I should expect such a man to feel it erelong an almost blasphemous thing for himself, as a weak servant of Christ, to add an uncertain human speculation to His sublime and tender Gospel ; and I should certainly know that he would find such a theory in his own hands, what I called it long ago, "a tin blade," poorly replacing the sword of the Spirit.

This, then, is the plan of administration concerning missionary candidates which I outlined at the start, and to which I still energetically adhere : No appointment of one distinctly and affirmatively committed to the theory of a future probation ; a candid, tender and sympathetic judgment of each case of perplexed and doubtful opinion, taking it by itself, and making no one a precedent for another ; when assured of a firm and intelligent hold on the essentials of evangelical faith in one thus doubting, a large reliance on missionary zeal, and on the educating force of missionary work, to bring the clearness and unity of right convictions to replace the state of intermingled and uncompleted thought and feeling presently presented. And I hope that nobody will be offended if I frankly add that about the last thing which I should do for a young man of ardent and receptive mind, in this dubious state, of whom I wanted to make a missionary, would be to discourage his missionary impulse, and send him back to Andover, with a more or less keen sense of repulse, to get further light on eschatology. I say this without prejudice, as without any favoring prepossession. I have seen Andover but once in more than thirty years, and then on an errand to the Abbott Academy. I shall very likely never see the place again. But with all respect for the accomplished and industrious teachers who occupy its chairs, I would far sooner send one to Zululand or Japan, on a mission for Christ, than send him to them, as an inquiring student, to get correct views of what some of them regard as "the larger hope." In moral therapeutics, and for purposes of cure, I doubt the maxim "*similia similibus*."

All this which I have rapidly written was contained implicitly, and most of it was articulated with perfect distinctness, in my letter accepting the Presidency. It was not, as I said, any fabricated scheme to meet an emergency. It seemed to me the dictate of a sound common sense, and of a temperate Christian wisdom. It was approved, at the time, by those in whose judgment I have more confidence than I have in my own. It appeared, in a measure, to relieve a tension which was fast becoming insupportable. It was adopted, without manifested dissent, by "both wings," at the recent meeting in New York. It is to-day, in my judgment, the fair, reasonable, almost the only basis, on which we can treat young men from our schools without injustice ; and the only basis of harmonious co-operation among those heretofore combined in the Board. It repeats the admonition to exercise "caution," and to give no approval to a doctrine which the Board has disallowed. But it frankly and fairly meets the feeling—which is a just feeling—of those who insist that young men of fine parts, of fine promise, of a fervent consecration and an earnest missionary temper, are not to be peremptorily repelled by the Board, because, without having reached a conclusion which it disapproves, their minds, under the influences around them, are in a transition state of doubt. Whether anybody else accepts it or not, I stand by this, as a fair and permanent method of action; and I applied it, and wished if possible to have others apply it, in the case lately before the Committee.

I had had no personal knowledge of the young man then appearing, until I met him, by my request, for a two hours' talk. He had written some things, as I partly knew and was afterward more fully advised, which I regretted, and which embarrassed his case before the Committee. But he left the distinct impression upon me of a sincere, manly, Christian student, who had come out of early and extreme unbelief into a clear apprehension of Christ, and a glad consecration to his service; who had no assured conviction on the subject of probation after death; who thought it a "perhaps," at least for some; probably, but not certainly, indicated by the famous passages in Peter; possibly, but not certainly, involved in the universality of the atonement; and who was as earnest to preach the Gospel as if he positively *knew* that after death was no chance of repentance. He seemed to me likely to make a good missionary—diligent, faithful, with a spirit receptive of what God should teach; and while I was sorry that his mind was not wholly in tune with mine, I should have been glad to leave that mind just where it was, with no fresh bias against my convictions, until missionary service had had its effect on him. Others thought differently, being as clear and conscientious as I was, in their adverse judgment; and under the circumstances I tried, as I have said, to secure the most inoffensive form in which to record the action thus adopted. I sincerely hope that the Andover professors may help him toward that light which he needs, as much as I should confidently expect that the idolaters of Asia would.

The length of this letter is becoming intolerable; yet please allow me a word or two more.

Attacks upon myself are of no account. I have met too many to now think of them twice; and the general verdict has not been discouraging. But I earnestly deprecate violent attacks on the Prudential Committee, or on either of the Secretaries. In this whole business there has been too much of confusing animosity. The members of the Committee are conscious of an important trust, and are keenly sensible of obligation to the Board. They are sincere and faithful men, differing in opinion, but all trying to do their duty fairly and kindly. Abuse is rarely an instrument of persuasion. It is only semi-barbarous men and women who try to work conviction in each other with broomsticks and bludgeons. In cases like those presented to the Committee, the "personal equation" is of necessity a significant factor in determining the judgment; and this is not likely to be favorably affected by acrid assault. It is no conventional form of words in which I say that I have the highest regard for all the members of the Committee, and for each of the Secretaries. The Home Secretary, whose name seems to many a modern synonym for perpendicular stiffness, has been a friend of mine since, as a boy older than himself, I fear that I sometimes tried his patience. I shall very likely differ from him again, and differ variously, in matters of detail; but I shall not fail affectionately to honor his soundness in doctrine, or his fidelity to his convictions. The dear and honored Vice-President of the Board is as near to my heart as if he were a brother by blood; and I cannot express the joy which I have felt in finding his experienced spirit, and his acute, practical mind, in close sympathy with mine, on whatever subjects have come before us. I am confident still, as I said at the Tabernacle, that those who have been divided heretofore, more by sympathy than by doctrine, are surely coming to work together, with mutual respect and with cordial consent; not seeking the reversing of any action of the Board, but recognizing the fact that intelligent caution is not at all indiscriminate prohibition, that acknowledged perplexity is not of necessity factious or virulent, and agreeing sometimes to appoint the honest inquiring doubter, without forcing him to statements which he cannot accept, and without, on the other hand, indorsing his doubt.

At any rate, I have no other wisdom to present on the subject than this, which was expressed two years ago, and is here expressed again. I have given to the office which I was most unwilling to take a large measure of the strength which is not altogether as elastic as it was, and in the aggregate many weeks out of the years which are passing like swift and vanishing clouds. I can fairly call all to witness that every suggestion in my letter of acceptance, looking toward harmony, has been on my part punctually fulfilled. A Committee has been appointed, and continued, to consider the relation of the Board to the churches. Another Committee has been appointed—composed, in a majority, of those critical of the methods pursued at the Rooms—to investigate those methods. I have done what I could, and shall do it hereafter, to carry out fully the terms and the spirit of my primary Letter, toward candidates for appointment. I am intent upon only one end: to have the Board maintain its faith, restore its unity, and send the Good Tidings, to proclaim which is its glory, with wider sweep than ever before throughout the world. The way to this seems to me as plain as the path across the Brooklyn Bridge. I do not expect to grow weary in well doing till the Master says, "Cease! Come, and give thy account!" If others go with me, I am perfectly assured that the end we desire is not far off; and in that end will be a reward for everything that any of us have done, for all our waiting, and all our work. But if any one has a better wisdom on this entangled and irritating matter, which has stirred so much controversy that it now seems difficult to touch it without passion, if he will take the place at the head of the Board which I shall only too gladly vacate, I will give every atom of personal influence to his support; and he will be hailed by no one else with so quick an enthusiasm as by

Yours faithfully,
R. S. Storrs.

PARAGRAPHIC.

Professor Charles August Hase, the well-known German theologian, died on the 3d of January, at Jena. Professor Hase was born in Steinbach, Saxony, in 1800. He became professor of theology at Jena in 1830. He is best known in this country from his "History of the Church."

A pretty little girl and a young gentleman met on the street, and the following conversation took place. She—"Why, Will, what are you doing down here? I thought you were in A." He—"Oh, I'm down here attending the college of pharmacy over here on Court Street." She—"And you are going to be a farmer? How nice that will be!" gleefully clapping her hands.—*The Southern Churchman, Richmond, Va., January 2d*, 1890.

At a recent introduction of a bishop to his see somebody noticed a Dublin graduate wearing an Oxford hood. He pointed it out to the bishop, and said that this person stood there with a lie on his back. "Well," replied his lordship, "you can hardly call it a lie, but it is certainly a falsehood." —*The Living Church, Chicago, January 18th*, 1890.

His Pedigree.—*Englishman* (to stranger): "Excuse me, sir, but aren't you a foreigner?" *Stranger:* "Foreigner? No, sir. I'm an American, pure and simple." *Englishman:* "Ah! and what tribe do you belong to, please?"—*The Christian Register, Boston, January 16th*, 1890.

Lacordaire wrote of his conversion: "Once a real Christian, the world did not vanish before my eyes. It rather assumed nobler proportions, as I did myself. Instead of a great, fleeting, empty theatre of ambition, I began to see therein the suffering needing help; and could imagine nothing comparable to the happiness of ministering to it with the help of the cross of the Gospel of Christ." The Christian should love the world much, not for itself, but because of the opportunity it presents of noblest service for the glory of God. For even God Himself "so loved the world."—*The Standard of the Cross, Philadelphia, Pa., December 28th*, 1889.

In a certain church in Ireland a young priest was detailed to preach. The occasion was his first appearance, and he took for his text, "The feeding of the multitude." He said: "They fed ten people with ten thousand loaves of bread and ten thousand fishes." An old Irishman said, "That's no miracle; begorra I could do that myself," which the priest overheard. The next Sunday the priest announced the same text, but he had it right this time. He said, "And they fed ten thousand people on ten loaves of bread and ten fishes." He waited a second or two, and then leaned over the pulpit, and said, "And could you do that, Mr. Murphy?" Mr. Murphy replied, "And sure, your reverence, I could." "And how could you do it, Mr. Murphy?" said the priest. "And sure, your reverence, I could feed them with what was over from last time."—*The Reformed Church Record, Reading January 9th*, 1890.

Here is the way Bob Burdette puts it. Let the grumbling brother beware.

Home returneth the good pastor from an earned vacation in Europe, joyously greeting his native land. To him the elder, far better than the pastor, comes with fervent greeting for his welcome home. Shaking his head sadly, he says with earnestness that far outstrips his originality, "Ah, parson, the devil never takes a vacation."

"No indeed," the parson replied, with an outburst of genuine heartiness, "he doesn't need one; he never works hard enough. If he should take my contract to drag this congregation up hill to heaven, instead of merely amusing himself by dancing with it on the primrose grade, he'd want a vacation every six weeks, and then he'd break down before the year was out."—*The Central Baptist, St. Louis, December 26th*, 1889.

Marriage and Divorce.—If Congress can in any way bring about suitable legislation respecting marriage and divorce, that shall have a scope as wide as the entire nation, a great boon will be conferred upon the people. As matters now stand, with the laws on these subjects wholly in the hands of the individual States, not only are the statutes often contradictory, but it is rendered very easy for base persons to take advantage of such contradictions to foster and further evil designs. The number of decrees of divorce issued in the country each year is simply appalling. Every good Christian ought to do his best to bring forward the teaching of the New Testament as here affording the only true rule, and all ministers should be very cautious, lest they unwittingly increase the more or less prevailing spirit of indifference. All who have the good of this nation at heart should use what influence they have to mould public sentiment for the procuring of uniform and correct legislation on these matters, so important for the family life of the people.—*The Moravian, Bethlehem January 15th*, 1890.

AGNOSTICISM.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.

(Continued from the January number, p. 249.)

WHAT is his answer to that simple and broad question? Strange to say, absolutely none at all! He leaves this vital question without any answer, and goes back to the Gadarene swine. The question he raises is whether the supposed incredibility of the story of the Gadarene swine involves the general untrustworthiness of the story of the Gospels; and his conclusion is that it involves the incredibility of the story of the Gadarene swine. A more complete evasion of his own question it would be difficult to imagine. As Professor Huxley almost challenges me to state what I think of that story, I have only to say that I fully believe it, and moreover that Professor Huxley, in this very article, has removed the only consideration which would have been a serious obstacle to my belief. If he were prepared to say, on his high scientific authority, that the narrative involves a contradiction of established scientific truth, I could not but defer to such a decision, and I might be driven to consider those possibilities of interpolation in the narrative, which Professor Huxley is good enough to suggest to all who feel the improbability of the story too much for them. But Professor Huxley expressly says:

> I admit I have no *a priori* objection to offer. . . . For anything I can absolutely prove to the contrary, there may be spiritual things capable of the same transmigration, with like effects. . . . So I declare, as plainly as I can, that I am unable to show cause why these transferable devils should not exist.

Very well, then, as the highest science of the day is unable to show cause against the possibility of the narrative, and as I regard the Gospels as containing the evidence of trustworthy persons who were contemporary with the events narrated, and as their general veracity carries to my mind the greatest possible weight, I accept their statement in this as in other instances. Professor Huxley ventures "to doubt whether at this present moment any Protestant theologian, who has a reputation to lose, will say that he believes the Gadarene story." He will judge whether I fall under his description; but I repeat that I believe it, and that he has removed the only objection to my believing it.

However, to turn finally to the important fact of external evidence. Professor Huxley reiterates, again and again, that the verdict of scientific criticism is decisive against the supposition that we possess in the four Gospels the authentic and contemporary evidence of known writers. He repeats, "without the slightest fear of refutation, that the four Gospels, as they have come to us, are the work of unknown writers." In particular, he challenges my allegation of "M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case;" and he adds the following observations, to which I beg the reader's particular attention:

> I thought (he says) I knew M. Renan's works pretty well, but I have contrived to miss this "practical"—(I wish Dr. Wace had defined the scope of that useful adjective)—surrender. However, as Dr. Wace can find no difficulty in pointing out the passage of M. Renan's writings, by which he feels justified in making his statement, I shall wait for further enlightenment, contenting myself, for the present, with remarking that if M. Renan were to retract and do penance in Notre Dame tomorrow for any contributions to biblical criticism that may be specially his property, the main results of that criticism, as they are set forth in the works of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar, for example, would not be sensibly affected.

Let me begin then, by enlightening Professor Huxley about M. Renan's surrender. I have the less difficulty in doing so as the passages he has contrived to miss have been collected by me already in a little tract on the "Authenticity of the Gospels,"* and in some lectures on the "Gospel and its Witnesses;"† and I shall take the liberty, for convenience' sake, of repeating some of the observations there made.

I beg first to refer to the preface to M. Renan's "Vie de Jésus."‡ There M. Renan says:

> As to Luke, doubt is scarcely possible. The Gospel of St. Luke is a regular composition, founded upon earlier documents. It is the work of an author who chooses, curtails, combines. The author of this Gospel is certainly the same as the author of the Acts of the Apostles. Now, the author of the Acts seems to be a companion of St. Paul—a character which accords completely with St. Luke. I know that more than one objection may be opposed to this reasoning; but one thing at all events is beyond doubt, namely, that the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is a man who belonged to the second apostolic generation; and this suffices for our purpose. The date of this Gospel, moreover, may be determined with sufficient precision by considerations drawn from the book itself. The twenty-first chapter of St. Luke, which is inseparable from the rest of the work, was certainly written after the siege of Jerusalem, but not long after. We are, therefore, here on solid ground, for we are dealing with a work proceeding entirely from the same hand, and possessing the most complete unity.

---

* Religious Tract Society.

† John Murray, 1883.

‡ Fifteenth edition, p. xlix.

It may be important to observe that this admission has been supported by M. Renan's further investigations, as expressed in his subsequent volume on "The Apostles." In the preface to that volume he discusses fully the nature and value of the narrative contained in the Acts of the Apostles, and he pronounces the following decided opinions as to the authorship of that book, and its connection with the Gospel of St. Luke (page x. *sq.*) :

> One point which is beyond question is that the Acts are by the same author as the third Gospel, and are a continuation of that Gospel. One need not stop to prove this proposition, which has never been seriously contested. The prefaces at the commencement of each work, the dedication of each to Theophilus, the perfect resemblance of style and of ideas, furnish on this point abundant demonstrations.
>
> A second proposition, which has not the same certainty, but which may, however, be regarded as extremely probable, is that the author of the Acts is a disciple of Paul, who accompanied him for a considerable part of his travels.

At a first glance, M. Renan observes, this proposition appears indubitable, from the fact that the author, on so many occasions, uses the pronoun "we," indicating that on those occasions he was one of the apostolic band by whom St. Paul was accompanied. "One may even be astonished that a proposition apparently so evident should have found persons to contest it." He notices however, the difficulties which have been raised on the point, and then proceeds as follows (page 14) :

> Must we be checked by these objections? I think not; and I persist in believing that the person who finally prepared the Acts is really the disciple of Paul, who says "we" in the last chapters. All difficulties, however insoluble they may appear, ought to be, if not dismissed, at least held in suspense, by an argument so decisive as that which results from the use of this word "we."

He then observes that MSS. and tradition combine in assigning the third Gospel to a certain Luke, and that it is scarcely conceivable that a name in other respects obscure should have been attributed to so important a work for any other reason than that it was the name of the real author. Luke, he says, had no place in tradition, in legend, or in history, when these two treatises were ascribed to him. M. Renan concludes in the following words : "We think, therefore, that the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is in all reality Luke, the disciple of Paul."

Now let the import of these expressions of opinion be duly weighed. Of course, M. Renan's judgments are not to be regarded as affording in themselves any adequate basis for our acceptance of the authenticity of the chief books of the New Testament. The Acts of the Apostles and the four Gospels bear on their face certain positive claims, on the faith of which they have been accepted in all ages of the Church ; and they do not rest, in the first instance, on the authority of any modern critic. But though M. Renan would be a very unsatisfactory witness to rely upon for the purpose of positive testimony to the Gospels, his estimates of the value of modern critical objections to those sacred books have all the weight of the admissions of a hostile witness. No one doubts his familiarity with the whole range of the criticism represented by such names as Strauss and Baur, and no one questions his disposition to give full weight to every objection which that criticism can urge. Even without assuming that he is prejudiced on either one side or the other, it will be admitted on all hands that he is more favorably disposed than otherwise to such criticism as Professor Huxley relies on. When, therefore, with this full knowledge of the literature of the subjects, such a writer comes to the conclusion that the criticism in question has entirely failed to make good its case on a point like that of the authorship of St. Luke's Gospel, we are at least justified in concluding that critical objections do not possess the weight which unbelievers or sceptics are wont to assign to them. M. Renan, in a word, is no adequate witness to the Gospels ; but he is a very significant witness as to the value of modern critical objections to them.

Let us pass to the two other so-called "synoptical" Gospels. With respect to St. Matthew, M. Renan says in the same preface ("Vie de Jésus," p. lxxxi.) :

> To sum up, I admit the four canonical Gospels as serious documents. All go back to the age which followed the death of Jesus ; but their historical value is very diverse. St. Matthew evidently deserves peculiar confidence for the discourses. Here are "the oracles," the very notes taken while the memory of the instruction of Jesus was living and definite. A kind of flashing brightness at once sweet and terrible, a divine force, if I may so say, underlies these words, detaches them from the context, and renders them easily recognizable by the critic.

In respect again to St. Mark, he says (p. lxxxii.):

> The Gospel of St. Mark is the one of the three synoptics which has remained the most ancient, the most original, and to which the least of later additions have been made. The details of fact possess in St. Mark a definiteness which we seek in vain in the other evangelists. He is fond of reporting certain sayings of our Lord in Syro-Chaldaic. He is full of minute observations, proceeding, beyond doubt, from an eye-witness. There is nothing to

conflict with the supposition that this eye-witness, who had evidently followed Jesus, who had loved him and watched him in close intimacy, and who had preserved a vivid image of him, was the apostle Peter himself, as Papias has it.

I call these admissions a "practical surrender" of the adverse case, as stated by critics like Strauss and Baur, who denied that we had in the Gospels contemporary evidence, and I do not think it necessary to define the adjective, in order to please Professor Huxley's appetite for definitions. At the very least it is a direct contradiction of Professor Huxley's statement* that we know "absolutely nothing" of "the originator or originators" of the narratives in the first three Gospels; and it is an equally direct contradiction of the case, on which his main reply to my paper is based, that we have no trustworthy evidence of what our Lord taught and believed.

But Professor Huxley seems to have been apprehensive that M. Renan would fail him, for he proceeds, in the passage I have quoted, to throw him over and to take refuge behind "the main results of biblical criticism, as they are set forth in the works of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar, for example." It is scarcely comprehensible how a writer, who has acquaintance enough with this subject to venture on Professor Huxley's sweeping assertions, can have ventured to couple together those four names for such a purpose. "Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar!" Why, they are absolutely destructive of one another! Baur rejected Strauss's theory and set up one of his own; while Reuss and Volkmar in their turn have each dealt fatal blows at Baur's. As to Strauss, I need not spend more time on him than to quote the sentence in which Baur himself puts him out of court on this particular controversy. He says,† "The chief peculiarity of Strauss's work is, that it is a criticism of the Gospel history without a criticism of the Gospels." Strauss, in fact, explained the miraculous stories in the Gospels by resolving them into myths, and it was of no importance to his theory how the documents originated. But Baur endeavored, by a minute criticism of the Gospels themselves, to investigate the historical circumstances of their origin; and he maintained that they were *Tendenz-Schriften*, compiled in the second century, with polemical purposes. Volkmar, however, is in direct conflict with Baur on this point, and in the very work to which Professor Huxley refers,‡ he enumerates (p. 18) among "the written testimonies of the first century"—besides St. Paul's epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans, and the apocalypse of St. John—"the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, according to John Mark of Jerusalem, written a few years after the destruction of Jerusalem, between the years 70 and 80 of our reckoning—about 75 probably; to be precise, about 73," and he proceeds to give a detailed account of it, "according to the oldest text, and particularly the Vatican text," as indispensable to his account of Jesus of Nazareth. He treats it as written (p. 172) either by John Mark of Jerusalem himself, or by a younger friend of his. Baur, therefore, having upset Strauss, Volkmar proceeds to upset Baur; and what does Reuss do? I quote again from that splendid French edition of the Bible, on which Professor Huxley so much relies. On page 88 of Reuss's introduction to the synoptic Gospels, he sums up "the results he believes to have been obtained by critical analysis," under thirteen heads; and the following are some of them:

> 2. Of the three synoptic Gospels one only, that which ecclesiastical tradition agrees in attributing to Luke, has reached us in its primitive form.
>
> 3. Luke could draw his knowledge of the Gospel history partly from oral information; he was able, in Palestine itself, to receive direct communications from immediate witnesses. . . . We may think especially here of the history of the passion and the resurrection, and perhaps also of some other passages of which he is the sole narrator.
>
> 4. A book, which an ancient and respectable testimony attributes to Mark, the disciple of Peter, was certainly used by St. Luke as the principal source of the portion of his Gospel between chapter iv. 31, and ix. 50; and between xviii. 15, and xxi. 38.
>
> 5. According to all probability, the book of Mark, consulted by Luke, comprised in its primitive form what we read in the present day from Mark i. 21, to xiii. 37.

It seems unnecessary, for the purpose of estimating the value of Professor Huxley's appeal to these critics, to quote any more. It appears from these statements of Reuss that if "the results of biblical criticism," as represented by him, are to be trusted, we have the whole third Gospel in its primitive form, as it was written by St. Luke; and in this, as we have seen, Reuss is in entire agreement with Renan. But besides this, a previous book written by Mark, St. Peter's disciple, was certainly in existence before Luke's Gospel, and was used by Luke; and in all probability this book was, in its primitive form, the greater part of our present Gospel of St. Mark.

Such are those "results of biblical criticism" to which Professor Huxley has appealed; and we may fairly judge by these not only of the value of his special contention in reply to my paper, but of the worth of the sweeping assertions he, and writers like him, are given to making about modern critical science. Professor Huxley says that we know "absolutely nothing" about the originators of the Gospel narratives, and he appeals to criticism in the persons of Volkmar and Reuss. Volkmar says that the second Gospel is really either by St. Mark or by one of his friends, and was written about the year 75. Reuss says that the third Gospel, as we now have it, was really by St. Luke. Now Professor Huxley is, of course, entitled to his own opinion; but he is not entitled to quote authorities in support of his opinion when they are in direct opposition to it. He asserts, without the slightest fear of refutation, that "the four Gospels, as they have come to us, are the work of unknown writers." His arguments in defence of such a position will be listened to with great respect; but let it be borne in mind that the opposite arguments he has got to meet are not only those of orthodox critics like myself, but those of Renan, of Volkmar, and of Reuss—I may add of Pfleiderer, well known in this country by his Hibbert Lectures, who, in his recent work on original Christianity, attributes most positively the second Gospel in its present form to St. Mark, and declares that there is no ground whatever for that supposition of an *Ur-Marcus*—that is, an original groundwork—from which Professor Huxley alleges that "at the present time there is no visible escape." If I were such an authority on morality as Professor Huxley, I might perhaps use some unpleasant language respecting this vague assumption of criticism being all on his side, when it, in fact, directly contradicts him; and his case is not the only one to which such strictures might be applied. In "Robert Elsmere," for example, there is some vaporing about the "great critical operation of the present century" having destroyed the historical basis of the Gospel narrative. As a matter of fact, as we have seen, the great critical operation has resulted, according to the testimony of the critics whom Professor Huxley himself selects, in establishing the fact that we possess contemporary records of our Lord's life from persons who were either eye-witnesses, or who were in direct communication with eye-witnesses, on the very scene in which it was passed. Either Professor Huxley's own witnesses are not to be trusted, or Professor Huxley's allegations are rash and unfounded. Conclusions which are denied by Volkmar, denied by Renan, denied by Reuss, are not to be thrown at our heads with a superior air, as if they could not be reasonably doubted. The great result of the critical operation of this century has, in fact, been to prove that the contention with which it started in the persons of Strauss and Baur, that we have no contemporary records of Christ's life, is wholly untenable. It has not convinced any of the living critics to whom Professor Huxley appeals; and if he, or any similar writer, still maintains such an assertion let it be understood that he stands alone against the leading critics of Europe in the present day.

---

* Page 24.

† "Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien," 1847, p. 41.

‡ "Jesus Nazarenus und die erste christliche Zeit," 1882.

Perhaps I need say no more for the present in reply to Professor Huxley. I have, I think, shown that he has evaded my point; he has evaded his own points; he has misquoted my words; he has misrepresented the results of the very criticism to which he appeals; and he rests his case on assumptions which his own authorities repudiate. The questions he touches are very grave ones, not to be adequately treated in a review article. But I should have supposed it is a point of scientific morality to treat them, if they are to be treated, with accuracy of reference and strictness of argument.

IV.

AGNOSTICISM.

A Reply to Professor Huxley.

BY W. C. MAGEE, BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

I SHOULD be wanting in the respect which I sincerely entertain for Professor Huxley if I were not to answer his "appeal" to me in the last number of this review for my opinion on a point in controversy between him and Dr. Wace. Professor Huxley asks me, "in the name of all that is Hibernian, why a man should be expected to call himself a miscreant or an infidel?" I might reply to this after the alleged fashion of my countrymen by asking him another question, namely—When or where did I ever say that I expected him to call himself by either of these names? I cannot remember having said anything that even remotely implied this, and I do not therefore exactly see why he should appeal to my confused "Hibernian" judgment to decide such a question.

As he has done so, however, I reply that I think it unreasonable to expect a man to call himself anything unless and until good and sufficient reason has been given him why he should do so. We are all of us bad judges as to what we are and as to what we should therefore be called. Other persons classify us according to what they know, or think they know, of our characters or opinions, sometimes correctly, sometimes incorrectly. And were I to find myself apparently incorrectly classified, as I very often do, I should be quite content with asking the person who had so classified me, first to define his terms, and next to show that these, as defined, were correctly applied to me. If he succeeded in doing this, I should accept his designation of me without hesitation, inasmuch as I should be sorry to call myself by a false name.

In this case, accordingly, if I might venture a suggestion to Professor Huxley, it would be that the term "infidel" is capable of definition, and that when Dr. Wace has defined it, if the professor accept his definition, it would remain for them to decide between them whether Professor Huxley's utterances do or do not bring him under the category of infidels, as so defined. Then, if it could be clearly proved that they do, from what I know of Professor Huxley's love of scientific accuracy and his courage and candor, I certainly should expect that he would call himself an infidel—and a miscreant, too, in the original and etymological sense of that unfortunate term, and that he would even glory in those titles. If they should not be so proved to be applicable, then I should hold it to be as unreasonable to expect him to call himself by such names as he, I suppose, would hold it to be to expect us Christians to admit, without better reason than he has yet given us, that Christianity is "the sorry stuff" which, with his "profoundly" moral readiness to say "unpleasant" things, he is pleased to say that it is.

There is another reference to myself, however, in the professor's article as to which I feel that he has a better right to appeal to me—or, rather, against me, to the readers of this review—and that is, as to my use, in my speech at the Manchester Congress, of the expression "cowardly agnosticism." I have not the report of my speech before me, and am writing, therefore, from memory; but my memory or the report must have played me sadly false if I am made to describe all agnostics as cowardly. A much slighter knowledge than I possess of Professor Huxley's writings would have certainly prevented my applying to all agnosticism or agnostics such an epithet.

What I intended to express, and what I think I did express by this phrase was, that there is an agnosticism which is cowardly. And this I am convinced that there is, and that there is a great deal of it too, just now. There is an agnosticism which is simply the cowardly escaping from the pain and difficulty of contemplating and trying to solve the terrible problems of life by the help of the convenient phrase, "I don't know," which very often means "I don't care." "We don't know anything, don't you know, about these things. Professor Huxley, don't you know, says that we do not, and I agree with him. Let us split a B. and S."

There is, I fear, a very large amount of this kind of agnosticism among the more youthful professors of that philosophy, and indeed among a large number of easy-going, comfortable men of the world, as they call themselves, who find agnosticism a pleasant shelter from the trouble of thought and the pain of effort and self-denial. And if I remember rightly it was of such agnostics I was speaking when I described them as "chatterers in our clubs and drawing-rooms," and as "freethinkers who had yet to learn to think."

There is therefore in my opinion *a* cowardly agnosticism just as there is also *a* cowardly Christianity. A Christian who spends his whole life in the selfish aim of saving his own soul, and never troubles himself with trying to help to save other men, either from destruction in the next world or from pain and suffering here, is a cowardly Christian. The eremites of the early days of Christianity, who fled away from their place in the world where God had put them, to spend solitary and, as they thought, safer lives in the wilderness, were typical examples of such cowardice. But in saying that there is such a thing as *a* cowardly Christianity, I do not thereby allege that there is no Christianity which is not cowardly. Similarly, when I speak of *a* cowardly agnosticism, I do not thereby allege that there is no agnosticism which is not cowardly, or which may not be as fearless as Professor Huxley has always shown himself to be.

I hope that I have now satisfied the professor on the two points on which he has appealed to me. There is much in the other parts of his article which tempts me to reply. But I have a dislike to thrusting myself into other men's disputes, more especially when a combatant like Dr. Wace, so much more competent than myself, is in the field. I leave the professor in his hands, with the anticipation that he will succeed in showing him that a scientist dealing with questions of theology or biblical criticism may go quite as far astray as theologians often do in dealing with questions of science.

(*To be continued.*)

GOODLY WORDS.

Original translations from Meister Eckart, by C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

(*Continued from page* 250.)

(Mart. xxviii.) Learned people do not like that the soul be placed so near the Divine and attributed so much divine likeness. The reason of this is, that they do not know the nobility of the soul from the bottom off. If they knew it, they would not, on some points, make a distinction between the soul and God.

It is a wonder to me, and I have often pondered upon it, why the soul is not capable of speaking the Word as powerfully as the Heavenly Father. Some Masters say that the reason is this that that which is *essentially* in the Father is only in the soul as an *image.* I do not believe in such talk. If you take away the attributes of the soul, she is anyhow essentially like unto God. Other Masters say: that which God is, He is from Himself, but that which the soul possesses, she possesses as a gift, hence she cannot be like unto God in doings. I contradict this, too. The Son has also received from the Father, that which He is, yet He acts with the same power as the Father. He and the Father send forth the Holy Spirit with equal power and perfection. Hence this cannot be a hindrance to the soul.

There is, however, an other reason, to which I feel inclined to bow down. It is this, the Son has come forth out of the Father and has remained one with him, essentially; hence He is personally capable of the same as the Father, but the soul has come forth from the divine persons, and has not remained one with them, essentially. Yea, she has got a different, a strange existence; still, this has also come forth from out the Deity.

The Church. I.

"*Which is the true Church, or the Gospel-Church, or the Church according to the new Covenant?* A Church of inward Worshippers—of such as are inwardly holy—of such as offer inward Incense and Sacrifices—of inwardly redeemed ones, from the inward Egypt, from the inward Darkness and Power of Satan—a Church that hath the inward Ark, the inward Presence, the inward Manna."

"*Which is the true Gospel-Ministry, and who are the true Gospel Ministers?* Those whom Christ sends forth in the Spirit and Power of his Father to gather and build up this Church.—How can any minister Life unto the people, or build them up in the Life, Spirit and Power, but who are in the Life, Spirit and Power?—They are the Ministers of the Gospel, who have received that Spirit and Power wherein the Ministry of the Gospel stands. The Ministry of the Gospel is in the Light, Spirit, and Power of the most High, to turn peoples minds to a proportion of the same Light, Spirit and Power in themselves, and so to come to the manifestation and quickning of the same Life in themselves, that so they may walk in the same Light. O how precious is this Ministry!"

(From Isaac Penington's *A Question to the Professors of Christianity.* London, 1680, pp. 150 and 210.)

The Church. II.

There was once a learned man who longed and prayed for eight years that God would show him one to teach him the Way of Truth. Once, while he thus longed and prayed there came to him a voice from Heaven, which said: "Go to the church door, there you shall find a man to show you the Way of Blessedness."

So thither he went, and found a poor man whose feet were torn, and covered with dirt and dust, and whose clothing was worth scarcely three pennies. He greeted him, saying: "God give you a good morning." Thereat he answered: "I never had a bad morning." Again he said: "God prosper thee," to which the other replied: "I never had anything but prosperity." "Heaven save you, how do you answer me!" retorted the Scholar, but only to get this odd reply: "I was never other than saved."

"Explain this to me for I do not understand you." "Willingly," said the poor man. "You wish me a good morning. I never had a bad morning, for if I hunger, I praise God; if I am cold, or it hails, snows, rains; if the weather is fair or foul, I praise God—therefore I never had a bad morning. You say, God prosper thee. I have never been unprosperous, for I know how to live with God. I know that that which He does is the best, and what God ordaineth for me, be it pain or pleasure, that I take cheerfully from Him as the best of all—therefore have I no adversity. You wish that God would bless me. I was never unblessed, for I desire only to be in the Will of God, and I have so given up my will to the Will of God, that that which God will I will."

"But if God were to cast you into hell," said the Scholar, "what would you then do?"

"Cast me into hell? His goodness holds Him back therefrom. Yet if He did, I would have two arms to embrace Him withal. One arm is true Humility, and therewith am I one with His holy humanity. And with the right arm of Love, I would embrace Him, so that He must come with me into hell too. And even so, I would rather be in hell, and have God, than in heaven, and not have Him."

Then understood the Scholar that true abandonment, with utter abasement, was the nearest way to God.

The Scholar asked: "Whence comest thou?" and was answered: "From God."

"Where hast thou found God?"

"Where I abandoned all creatures! I am a king. My kingdom is my soul. All my powers, within and without, do homage to my soul. This kingdom is greater than any kingdom on the earth."

(This narrative is found in an appendix to Tauler's *Medulla animæ*, but is usually attributed to Eckart.)

There are ten commandments hung on the walls of the Hindu Theological College in Madras. *Homeward Mail* reproduces them: (1) Pray to God as soon as you rise from your bed—5, 5.10 A.M. (2) Wash your body and keep your surroundings clean—5.10, 5.30 A.M. (3) Prostrate yourself before your parents or guardians, and take good exercise—5.30, 6.30 A.M. (4) Prepare well your school lesson—6.30, 9 A.M. (5) Attend school regularly and punctually, and do the school work properly. (6) Obey and respect your teachers and the teachers of the other classes, and other respectable persons. (7) Read till 8 P.M. at home. (8) Pray to God and go to bed—9 P.M. to 5 A.M. (9) Keep good company and avoid bad company. (10) Practice righteousness at all times.—*The Living Church, January 11th,* 1890.

I don't want to find out causes why God will save me, but I want to find out evidence that He has saved me.—*The Moravian, Bethlehem, Pa., January 8th,* 1890.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE LILY AMONG THORNS. A study of the Biblical drama, entitled The Song of Songs. By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D., Pastor of the Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, Mass., and author of "The Mikado's Empire." Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1890 [1889]. 16mo, pp. viii., 274. $1.25 and $1.50 (handsomer binding).

This is one of the fruits of the great revival in Biblical study, and another proof that to the open eye wondrous things are shown in the Word of God. It is the product of a pastor, and has a certain homiletical atmosphere. It is also the product of a painstaking, fair-minded scholar, to whom facts count for more than fancies, and the text is higher in importance than the expositors. The book is very modern in spirit, not to say thoroughly American. It betrays its nationality on more than one page. Dr. Griffis rejects *in toto* the allegorical and the mystical interpretations of the Song. He denies its alleged Solomonic origin, or that it was intended as an epithalamium for Solomon. On the contrary, he holds that the author was some Ephraimite or Northern Hebrew who lived about Solomon's time. He inclines to the view that the Song was suggested by the incident concerning Abishag, the beautiful maiden of Shunem, chosen to nurse David in his last days. He considers the Song a drama of five acts and fourteen scenes. Holding these views, he divides the text, which is that of the Revised English Bible, into acts and scenes, with appropriate headings, marginal references to the speakers, and what may be called stage directions.

But going somewhat into detail respecting this important volume, the following is the scheme of the book: Part I., History and criticism, in which he discusses in successive chapters the theory and interpretation of the Song; the life and times of King Solomon; the historic characters in the poem; its poetic background, dramatic structure and history as a book. Part II. is the text of the Revised Version, arranged according to his ideas; Part III. is "Studies and Comments," in which he pays attention to minute points as they come up, and gives piecemeal what is essentially a new translation of the entire book. It will be seen from this scheme that the book is not a commentary in the ordinary sense of that term.

"That love must rise spontaneously, and be true, is the supreme lesson of this divinely inspired drama" (p. 20). And surely such a lesson is worthy the Book of God. Those who seek in allegorical vaporizings and erotic fancies a justification of the presence of the book in the Bible, ignore the fact that pure love between the sexes is in itself worthy of treatment by the pen of inspiration. It is striking evidence of the difficulty of handling the subject that the Song, which is really chaste, should be, on the one hand, interpreted as an incentive to unchastity, and, on the other, considered as merely a vehicle for pious reflection or covert prophecy. Dr. Griffis shows how the book has been and still is regarded as impure. Few ministers preach upon it unless they allegorize it. But the latter course is uncalled for. It does violence to the poetic character of the Song. It certainly makes it teach what no Hebrew of the period would for a moment have supposed it taught.

And yet, when the correctness of Dr. Griffis's position is fully granted, one is dissatisfied with the absence of the spiritual element in this volume. It seems to me that the author might have given more of a Christian coloring to his interpretation. There is no reason why moral truth alone should have been conveyed. It was good and brave to insist, as he so often does, that the poem is pure, and that a poem on human love is worthy of a place in the canon; but it would have been proper and more to edification to bring out more prominently the idea that human love is a type of the divine. It is here the volume, which is so able, so full of appropriate learning, so interesting, so satisfactory in its exegesis on the whole, needs supplementing.

On a few minor points I think Dr. Griffis is mistaken. On pages 85, 86, he alludes to "the mimic stage play, the private theatricals of the children in the market-place (Matt. xi. 17), and that [Jesus] branded the Pharisees, the consummate mask-wearers of his day, as 'stage-actors'—that is, hypocrites." But were those children actors in any other sense than our own at play? Their games imitated scenes of mourning or mirth, but they were hardly plays. And the second remark loses its point if our Lord spoke Aramaic, and that, and not Greek, was almost certainly his tongue. On page 219 he makes the shepherd lover visit his beloved so perfumed that the latch is redolent with myrrh from his hands. But the text seems to teach that it was the Shulamite who had the myrrh, for it reads, as quoted immediately below, "I rose to open to my beloved, and *my hands* dropped myrrh, and *my fingers* with liquid myrrh, upon the handles of the bolt." Is it Oriental to speak of the Shulamite's meeting her beloved "on the dear old *doorstep*"(p. 251) ? or as standing before the marriage altar and plighting her troth (p. 259) ?

Dr. Griffis has nothing good to say about Solomon. It is sad to find that so brilliant a character as he appears in legend and fancy cannot stand the test of critical examination. But we must give him up as an unworthy son of David, and mourn that one so gifted fell so low. Yet Dante puts him in heaven, and there we hope to find him.

There are many other points about this book of Dr. Griffis which I should like to dwell upon. I am confident that every reader will be pleased with the volume, and I trust the readers will be a multitude.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.

VISIONS AND NARRATIVES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By GEORGE EMLEN HARE, D.D., LL.D. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 12mo, pp. 196. $1.

This little volume contains a number of short papers on Old Testament subjects: The Origin of the Sabbath (Gen. i.–ii. 3) ; Sons of God and Daughters of Men (Gen. vi. 1–5) ; God Wrestling and Wrestled with (Gen. xxxii. 24–32) ; The Sense of Right and Wrong (Joseph's Brethren, Gen. xxxvii., xlii.) ; Zion ; Micaiah the Son of Imlah (1 Kings xxii. 1–37) ; The Covenant with David (2 Sam. vii. 12–17) ; The Lord of David (Ps. cx.) ; Sufferings and Expectations (Ps. xxii.) ; The Servant of the Lord (Is. xl.–lxvi.) ; The Great Day of the Lord (Joel ii. 28–32) ; The Kingdom to be set up by God (Dan. ii., vii., ix.) ; Belshazzar (Dan. v.) ; The Messenger of the Covenant (Mal. iii. 1). Almost all of them apply or illustrate in some way the theory that the prophetic vision is the prevailing method of revelation. The recognition of this, the author believes, explains the peculiarities and removes the difficulties of prophecy. In Is. xiii.—*e.g.*, the prophet foretells the taking of Babylon by Cyrus and the utter destruction of the city. There is no intimation that centuries should intervene between these two events. But the present total ruin of the city is the fulfilment of this prophecy, and accredits the other predictions of Isaiah. As he says in another connection, "A man standing on ground comparatively low may see in the prospect which presents itself mountain after mountain, one more distant than another, the second higher than the first, and the third transcending the second. He may see them all, and yet fail to see and even fail to imagine the plains and fruitful fields that lie between the several ridges. Joel's vision of time may have been like such a man's vision of place." With the help of this hypothesis the author takes Ps. xxii., as well as cx., as direct prediction of the sufferings and reign of Christ. It is applied not only to prophecy, but to the narratives of the Old Testament. The account of creation in Gen. i. is to be explained as a vision of a symbolical character, something like a parable. It does not trench upon the sphere of science at all ; its scope is purely theological and religious. The account is, however, not in conflict with science, if it be rightly interpreted. There is nothing in it, for example, to compel us to think of the "days" as natural days of twenty-four hours ; on the contrary, Gen. ii. 5 shows that this cannot be intended. In other cases the author is inclined to allegorize, as when he writes of Jacob's wrestling : "The vision was a representation of Jacob's past and present, as seen from the Divine point of view." Under such a treatment, the historical character of revelation vanishes. And with it vanishes the possibility of understanding it, for vision and allegory have always been things of private interpretation, which we are assured Scripture is not. As a member of the American Committee, the author speaks a word for the use of the Revised Bible which I wish might be heeded.

GEORGE F. MOORE.

THE SERMON BIBLE. ISAIAH TO MALACHI. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, 1890. 12mo, pp. 511. $1.50.

Since of pulpit helps there is scarcely any end, every preacher should select and use the very best. To this class, in our judgment, belongs the book before us. It contains condensed sketches, and in some cases simply skeletons and outlines of sermons on very many of the principal texts in the prophetic books of the Bible. Some of these sketches were taken directly from the manuscripts of their authors, and hence represent sermons which nowhere else appear in print. The range of authorship is very wide. It includes many of the great living preachers, many recently deceased, and many of former generations. But though representing different shades of theological belief, they are all brought together here in a kind of picture gallery, and made to address their fellow-men on the momentous subjects of the Christian life. Many of these sketches are striking for their originality, their freshness, and their suggestive qualities. Taken as a class they greatly exalt Christ, and bring out the lessons of God's providence in punishing sin and in rewarding righteousness. There are six sketches on the text: "Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off" (Is. xxxiii. 17); and three on the text: "A man of sorrows" (Is. liii. 3); and three on Dan. vi. 10. A striking feature of nearly all these sketches and outlines is their simplicity, their naturalness, their plain methods of inculcating sacred truth. This feature will be especially valuable to young ministers, who usually find it so hard to be simple and so difficult to address men from the pulpit in a straightforward and natural way. Another valuable feature of the book is its numerous references to sermons on other texts of each chapter. These constitute a kind of directory to the immense body of homiletic literature on the prophecies. But besides being a homiletical help to preachers, the volume will serve as a book of devotion for all classes of Christian readers.

J. W. Richard.

The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Edited by Dr. Philip Schaff. Vol. XIII. St. Chrysostom's Homilies. New York: Christian Literature Company. 8vo, cloth, pp. 599.

This is the thirteenth volume of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, and the twenty-third volume issued in connection with this noble undertaking by the Christian Literature Company. This volume appears in the fine style of the preceding volumes. It contains 599 pages, including a "Table of Contents;" an excellent notice of St. Chrysostom as a homilist, by Dr. J. A. Broadus; "Additional Notes," clear, concise, comprehensive, by Dr. Gross Alexander, Professor of New Testament Greek in Vanderbilt University, Tenn., and a "Preface," short but significant, by J. H. Newman.

The *Argument* prefacing some sets of the homilies are finely stated by Chrysostom himself—*e.g.*, the Homilies on Ephesians, on the First Epistle to Timothy, and on the Epistle to Philemon.

The book concludes with a complete Index of Subjects and a complete Index of Texts quoted.

Homilies, as is well known, are familiar addresses on certain passages of Scripture, more or less extended, imitated in the expository preaching of our day. In this direction perhaps Chrysostom excelled all the preachers of earlier or later times. He was free, forcible, versatile in his handling; skilful, sympathetic, searching, practical in his applications. "Efflorescent and repetitious," but emphatic, he was attractive to the masses, while he was impressive and effective with all his hearers. Attracting all classes by his downright earnestness and eloquence, he swayed them as an ambassador for Christ with divine commission, as though God did beseech men through him to be reconciled to God (2 Cor. v. 18–20).

Dr. Broadus remarks: "The sympathetic student will soon find that Christianity is with Chrysostom a living reality. He dwells always in its presence and companionship. He is profoundly in earnest and all alive. In his homilies you see the frequent questions, the abrupt turns of phrase, the multiplied repetitions, by which a skilled and sympathetic preacher, keenly watching his audience, strives to retain attention and to insure a more general comprehension. You are drawn near to him, and almost stand by his side."

Upon the whole, of all the expository preachers, John of the Golden Mouth is our very best example. Of all the good models, ancient or modern, the attentive student can learn most from Chrysostom.

Ransom Bethune Welch.

Among Cannibals. An account of four years' travels in Australia and of camp life with the aborigines of Queensland. By Carl Lumholtz, M.A., Member of the Royal Society of Sciences of Norway. Translated by Rasmus B. Anderson, ex-United States Minister to Denmark. With portrait, maps, 4 chromolithographs, and (123) woodcuts. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 8vo, pp. xx., 395. $5.

The volume now before us is one that will have interest to several classes of readers. The naturalist will find here a record that will open some new pages for him in his specialty; the student of anthropology will find facts and material for thought; those who delight in books of travel will find here new scenes and strange tales; those who have read and had their sympathies aroused by the tale of the woes and wrongs of the aborigines of America, will find that such treatment has not been restricted to this country; and those who take interest in the matter of missions will find an account of a land where such labor is sadly needed. It were impossible, in the limits of a notice here, to more than indicate the points of interest as above. That is all that will be attempted. It may be added that the book is well translated, and that the tale is told in such a way that interest does not flag. It comes to one with the attraction of novelty, and commands attention while it repays perusal.

The story is that of a man sent out by the University of Christiania, "with the object of making collections for the zoological and zootomical museums of the University, and of instituting researches into the customs and anthropology of the little-known tribes which inhabit" Australia. Central, Western, and Northern Queensland were the scenes of his travels. The volume contains an account of what was seen and learned, set down mainly as though in the form of a journal. In the form of an appendix there is a brief history of the continent, of its geology, flora and fauna. The maps are clear and well cut. The whole is completed with an excellent index, which adds materially to the value of the book.

C. R. GILLETT.

PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY: SOME SOCIAL STUDIES. By JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER. Boston: George H. Ellis. 16mo, pp. 293.

This volume is the product of a thoughtful Unitarian minister of Madison, Wis., who has gathered some excellent essays into a volume and given them a good running title. He has not attempted a continuous and thorough development of all the problems which are to be solved in American society, but mainly those which concern property, crime, education, economics, and religious co-operation. It would be too much to expect that all these essays should be equally fresh and instructive, but they are in each case the fruit of careful and independent thinking, and go down to the real issues that are involved in them. Mr. Crooker could not say anything new, though he says much which is suggestive concerning "The Student in American Life." His essay on this subject is simply helpful, not specially new in its thought. In discussing "Scientific Charity" he presents the history of organized charity since the beginning of the last century, and deals with the subject with great thoroughness and ability. We do not know where to look for a better monograph on this topic. The conclusion which he reaches is that the results of organized charity can rise no higher than the skill and zeal and fidelity of those charged with the care of these momentous interests. The essay on "The Root of the Temperance Problem" is one of the best in this little volume. What Mr. Crooker specially insists upon is the oft-neglected truth that the larger and deeper work for temperance must ever be carried forward chiefly by other methods than those which belong to fanaticism and drastic effort, and that temperance reform ought never to be separated in theory or practice from the general progress of humanity. In the essay devoted to "The Political Conscience," Mr. Crooker is less happy than in other papers. In dealing with "Moral and Religious Instruction in our Public Schools," Mr. Crooker is treating a subject that is very near to his heart, and in his conviction that Church and State must be separated, and that they cannot unite in any overt way in the public school, is a candid and reasonable treatment of a great question; but the essay to which we attach most value in this volume is the one devoted to "The Religious Destitution of Villages." Here Mr. Crooker is dealing with a very live question, one that sends out its roots very deeply into American life, and one that is before us for immediate and constant treatment. The question behind the destitution of religion in American villages is one that is fundamental in American religious life. It is the question whether some method cannot be reached by which religious co-operation and intellectual freedom may not be united in one administration of spiritual affairs. Mr. Crooker urges his point with great plainness and with marked ability. He makes the plea that the Church shall recognize as its basis and its bond the love of God and man, no more and no less; he also urges that the work of the Church shall be human service, a ministry of mercy, and a method of social progress and amelioration. He says: "The religious destitution of villages will cease just as soon as the Church comes to recognize that its mission is to inspire men to do good rather than to enforce theological uniformity; just as soon as it appeals to men for their service and self-sacrifice in behalf of those in sin and in sorrow; just as soon as it makes it possible for men to co-operate for human progress, beside its altar, regardless of differences of opinion on theological subjects outside the limit of rational thought." This is very wholesome and stimulating teaching from a Unitarian clergyman; it has the right ring in it, and it is by the prevalence of such teaching as this that a higher and better spiritual life will come to pervade American society. Mr. Crooker has won his place and recognition in this volume as one who is working wisely and helpfully for the broader and better construction of American life.

JULIUS H. WARD.

The Salt-Cellars. Being a Collection of Proverbs, together with Homely Notes thereon. By C. H. Spurgeon. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 12mo, pp. 367.

Mr. Spurgeon, if not the greatest of living preachers, is without doubt the most famous. This fame is his in part by his gifts as an orator, which would have won him equal fame at the bar or in Parliament, and in part by his faithfulness to the message that God has given him to declare. But there has been still another quality of his preaching to which his wide hearing is largely due—the quality of his style. No English orator of his day, save John Bright, has had the same mastery of vigorous Saxon English. His words go to the mark like a bullet, and strike with a force as deadly as the evils at which they are aimed. His style lends itself equally to scathing, blistering, overwhelming denunciation, and to the unsealing of the deepest fountains of love, pity, and penitence. Withal, it smacks of a racy wit, of a genial humor, and its sarcasms at times cut like a Damascus blade.

These characteristics appear with even greater plainness in some of Spurgeon's other works than in his sermons. In the character of "John Ploughman" he has written homely lectures to plain people, strongly reminding one in many ways of Franklin's "Poor Richard" and his saws, but excelling Franklin in being something more than the quintessence of shrewd, worldly wisdom. In these *Salt-Cellars* (the present volume being the second) he has worked the same vein, though perhaps not with equal success. The proverbs appear to be a compilation made on a principle more catholic than critical. "Three things," we are told on the title-page, "go to the making of a proverb—shortness, sense, and salt." The latter is sometimes present, if at all, in extreme homœopathic dilutions. The comments by Mr. Spurgeon, too, are often quite obvious, and neither assist one to the understanding of the proverb nor sharpen its suggestiveness.

It would be impossible, however, for any man, least of all for Mr. Spurgeon, to get together so many proverbs without making a notable assemblage of crisp sayings, most of them witty, many of them wise. There are few vices and foibles that are not here rebuked, few virtues that are not encouraged. It is the fashion with some moralists to sneer at proverbs as "copy-book morality," but we are not sure that it would not be well for our sons and daughters to have a selection from these pages at the head of their copy-books—if anything so old-fashioned as a copy-book survives in our modern schools. At any rate, no one is so old, and few are so wise, that they will not be profited by a reading of this book. It may also have the effect of giving to contemners of the Bible a higher appreciation of Solomon's collection of Proverbs. It is on record that Dr. Wayland was once told by a conceited Brown student that Solomon's proverbs could not have been inspired—anybody could write such things. "Very well, young man," said the good doctor, "make a few." Here is a fair specimen of what the world has been able to make since Solomon's day, sayings in which are gathered "the wisdom of many and the wit of one." Let them be compared with those collected under divine inspiration, and however highly the former may be approved by a candid judgment, the latter will still outrank them.

Henry C. Vedder.

The Patience of Hope, and other Sermons. By the late Rev. Joseph H. Wright. With a brief sketch of his life. Edited by Oliver J. Thatcher. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. 12mo, pp. 224. Cloth, $1.25.

In this volume Professor Thatcher, of the United Presbyterian Seminary at Allegheny, has rendered a filial tribute to his beloved pastor and friend. The sermons and the sketch of the writer are presented, as a memorial of his life, to his friends and former parishioners. The selection has been confined to fifteen sermons, and they are printed in their chronological order, ranging from the time when Mr. Wright was a student in the Union Seminary in New York to the time of his pastorate in Xenia, O. Some were prepared for special occasions, while others were preached in the ordinary course of Sabbath ministrations in his own pulpit. Among the former were: "The Call to the Ministry" (Eph. iv. 11), to the students of the Theological Seminary at Xenia; "Truth" (Prov. xxiii. 23), to the Christian Union of Monmouth College, Illinois.

The sermons are eminently Biblical and evangelical. They show depth of conviction and earnestness of purpose, forming thus a fitting memorial of one well beloved by those with and for whom he labored. It was therefore wise to publish them, although, in the nature of things, they will have a contracted audience. Such sermons may be the means of implanting the divine life in others, though they be not great.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, NOTES AND MAGAZINES.

ANDREÄ, Jac. 20 Predigten aus den Jahren 1557, 1559, und 1560, zum 300 jährl. Gedächtnistag seines Todes den 7. Jan. 1890, wieder herausgegeben mit einem kurzen Lebensabriss Andreä's und dem Bericht seines Kollegen Heerbrand über sein Ende von Schmoller. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. viii., 400, 8vo, 5 mk.

ANTZE, Ad. Die Religion Jesu Christi, in den Formen der kirchl. Dogmatik, entwickelt und dargestellt. Braunschweig: Schwetschke. Pp. xii., 335, 8vo, 6 mk.

BAEUMKER. Das Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie. Münster i. W.: Aschendorff. 8vo, 12 mk.

BELLOC, J. T. de. Le pays de Pharaons. Paris: Librairie de Paris, 1889. Pp. 416, 8vo, illust., 15 fr.

BESANT, Walter, and **PALMER, E. H.** Jerusalem: The City of Herod and Saladin. New edition, revised and enlarged. New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. Map, cloth, 8vo, $3.

BEZOLD, C. Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum. Vol. I. London: Longmans. Pp. xxxi., 420, 4to, 15s.

BOD, P. Historia Hungarorum Ecclesiastica, ed. L. W. E. Rauwenhoff. Vols. I. and II. Leiden: Brill. Pp. xvi., 477; vii., 426, 20 mk.

BOISSONNAS, G. De l'attitude de Jean-Baptiste en face de Jésus, d'après les données de évangiles synoptiques et du IVe évangile (Thèse). Paris: Libr. Leroux, 1889. Pp. 118, 8vo.

BON, Gustave C. (Chargé . . . d'une mission archéologique en Orient). Les premières civilisations (Egy. Assy. Judée. Phénic Perse). Paris: Marpon & Flammarion, 1889. Pp. 800, 8vo, 443 gravures, 10 fr.

BOOTH, Maud B., Mrs. Beneath Two Flags: The Aim, Methods of Work, History, and Progress of the Salvation Army. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. 12mo, cloth, $1.

BRACE, Charles Loring. The Unknown God: or, Inspiration among Pre-Christian Races. New York: Armstrong. 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

BRANDT, Sam., Prof. Ueber die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Lactantius. Nebst einer Untersuchung über das Leben des Lactantius und die Entstehungsverhältnisse seiner Prosaschriften. Wien: Tempsky. Pp. 66 + 70, 8vo, 2.10 fl.

BRÜCK, H., Prof. Dr. Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert. Vol. II. Mainz: Kirchheim. Pp. xvii., 592, 8vo' 7.60 mk.

BÜTTNER. Reisen in Kongoland. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. 8vo, 3 mk.

BUTEL, F. L'education des jésuites autrefois et aujourd'hui. Un collège breton. Paris: F. Didot, 1889. 8vo, 6 fr.

CAMPBELL, Wm. M. Footprints of Christ. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. Pp. 375, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

CARPENTER, W. Boyd (Bishop of Ripon). The Permanent Elements of Religion; being the Bampton Lectures for 1887. London and New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 148, 8vo, $2.

CHIPIEZ, Ch., and **PERROT, G.** Le Temple de Jérusalem et la maison du Bois-Liban, restitués d'après Ezechielet le livre des Rois. Ouvrage publié avec le concours de la Société des études juives, contenant 12 planches sur cuivre, 38 gravures, etc. Paris: Hachette, 1889. Folio, 100 fr.

THE SAME. Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité. Tome V. Phrygie, Lydie et Carie, Lucie, Perse. Paris: Hachette, 1889. 8vo, illust., 30 fr.

CHURCH, A. J., Rev., and **SEELEY, Richmond.** The Hammer: A Story of the Maccabees. London: Seeley & Co. Illust., cloth, 5s.

COLLINS, F. Howard. An Epitome of Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy. With a preface by Herbert Spencer. New York: Appleton. Pp. xviii., 576, 12mo, cloth, $2.50.

DELARC. St. Grégoire VII. et la réforme de l'église au XIe siècle. Tome I. Paris: Retaux-Bray. Pp. xcix., 402.

DUBOIS, Friedrich. Das Buch der Religionen. Bearbeitet von ——. 1 Lieferung. Stuttgart: Pfautsch, 1890. 8vo, 1 mk., 40 cts.

EBERS, Georg. Joshua: A Biblical Picture. Authorized edition. New York: Lovell, 1889. Pp. 267, 12mo, cloth, $1; paper, 50 cts.

EGELHAAF, G., Prof. Deutsche Geschichte im XVI. Jahrhundert bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden (Zeitalter der Reformation). 1 Bd., 1517–1526. Stuttgart: Cotta. Pp. viii., 680, 8vo, 8 mk.

EINFUHRUNG IN DIE HEILIGE SCHRIFT. Kurzgefasste Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten Lehren aus der Einleitung in das Alte und Neue Testament, der bibl. Hermeneutik und Archäologie. Regensburg: Verlagsanstalt, 1890. Pp. iv., 296, 8vo, 2 mk.

EMERSON, George H., D.D. The Bible and Modern Thought. Boston: Univ. Pub. House, 1890. Pp. 165, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

EVOLUTION: Popular Lectures and Discussions Before the Brooklyn Ethical Association. Boston: West, 1889. Pp. 400, 12mo, cloth, $2.

EWEN, J., Rev. India: Sketches and Stories of Native Life. London: Elliot Stock. Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d.

FROST, J. M. Pedo-Baptism: Is it from Heaven or of Men? Philadelphia: American Baptist Publishing Society, 1889. Pp. 199, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

GOTTLOB, Adolf, Dr. Aus der Camera Apostolica des XV. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Finanzwesens und des endenden Mittelalters. Innsbruck: Wagner. Pp. iii., 317, 8vo, 6 mk.

GUÉRIN, V. Jérusalem: Son histoire, sa description, ses établissements religieux. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie., 1889. Pp. viii., 503, carte 8vo, 7.50 fr.

HAUCK, A. Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands. II., 1. Die fränkische Kirche als Reichskirche. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1889. Pp. 431, 8vo, 8 mk.

HODGKIN, Thomas, D.C.L. The Dynasty of Theodosius; or, Eighty Years' Struggle with the Barbarians. London: Clarendon Press. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

HOYT, Wayland, D.D. Saturday Afternoon; or Conversations for the Culture of the Christian Life. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publishing Society, 1889. Pp. 302, cloth, $1.

HUNOLT, Francis, Rev. Sermons. Vols. V., VI. The Penitent Christian; or, Sermons on the Virtue and Sacrament of Penance. New York: Benziger Bros., 1889. 8vo, cloth, *net*, $5.

JOSEPHUS, F. Opera. Ed. et apparatu critico instruxit B. Niese. Vol. V. . . . Contra Apionem lib. II. Berlin: Weidmann, 1889. 8vo, 5 mk.

JOSEPHUS, F. Works. Whiston's translation. Revised by the Rev. A. R. Shilleto. . . . New York: Scribner & Welford. 3 vols. (Bohn's Library.) 12mo, $4.50.

KEHR, P. Die Urkunden Otto III. Innsbruck: Wagner. 7.60 mk.

KLEFFLER, H. Philosophie morale. La Conscience naturelle et la conscience religieuse. Geneva, 1889; Paris: Fishbacher. 12mo, 3 fr.

KOBLER, Andr. (S. J.). Katholisches Leben im Mittelalter. Bd. 4 (Schluss). Innsbruck: Vereinsbuchhandlung. Pp. viii., 940, 8vo, 9.60 mk.

LANGER, J. Das Buch Job in neuer und treuer Uebersetzung nach der Vulgata. 3. aufl. Das Hohelied nach seiner mystischen Erklärung (Eine Paraphrase). 2. Aufl. Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1889. Pp. xx., 219 and ix., 86, 8vo. 3 mk.

LAW, Thomas Graves (Librarian, Signet Library). An Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, with a reprint of Christopher Bagshaw's "True Relation of the Faction Begun at Wisbich," and illustrative documents. London: Nutt. Pp. 324, 8vo, cloth, 15s.

LEFRANC, Abel. La jeunesse de Calvin. Paris: Fishbacher, 1888. Pp. xvi., 231, 8vo, 10 fr.

LUX MUNDI. A series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation. Edited by Charles Gore, M A. London: John Murray; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. Pp. xxiii., 525, 8vo, cloth, $5.60.

MARBACH. Die Psychologie des Firmianus Lactantius. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Psychologie. Halle a.S.: Pfeffer. 8vo, 1.50 mk.

MARTIN, J. P. P. Introduction à la critique générale de l'Ancien Testament. De l'origine du Pentateuque. Tome III. Paris: Maisonneuve. 40 fr.

METHODIST YEAR BOOK for 1890. Edited by W. H. DePuy. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1890. Pp. 90, 12mo, paper, 10 cts.

MONNERON, H. Le Sermon sur la montagne (Matt. v.-viii.). Etude pratique illustrée par des faits. Lausanne, 1889. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

MOULE, H. C. G., Rev. Thoughts on Secret Prayer. London: Seeley & Co., 1889. Cloth, 1s.

MOZLEY, T., Rev. The Word. London: Longmans, Green & Co.; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. 12mo, cloth, $2.50.

MUELLER, G. A. Christus bei Josephus Flavius. Innsbruck: Wagner. 1.60 mk.

NEHMIZ, H. Die Betheiligung der weiblichen Jugend an der kirchlichen Diakonie. Referat . . . 1889. Berlin: Wiegandt. Pp. 23, 8vo, 40 pf.

NITZSCH, F. Die Idee und die Stufen d. Opfercultus. Ein Beitrag zur allgemeln. Religionsgeschichte. Rektoratsrede. Kiel, 1 mk.

OETTINGEN, A. v. Zur Geschichte des Jenseits, mit einem Nachwort über Weltuntergang und jüngstes Gericht. Dorpat: Karow, 1889. Pp. 60, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

PAGE, W. M. New Light from Old Eclipses; or, Chronology Corrected and the Four Gospels Harmonized by the Rectification of Errors in the Received Astronomical Tables. Introduction by Rev. James H. Brookes, D.D. St. Louis: Barns Publishing Co., 1890. Pp. xv., 590, 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

PALGRAVE, Francis T. (Professor, Oxford). The Treasury of Sacred Song. Selected from the English lyrical poetry of four centuries, with notes explanatory and biographical. London: Clarendon Press, 1889. Post 8vo, half vellum, 10s. 6d.

PETER, P. A. History of the Reformation. Columbus, O.: Lutheran Book Concern, 1890. 16mo, cloth, 75 cts.

PIERSON, A. T., D.D. Keys to the Word; or, Helps to Bible Study. (New cheaper edition.) New York: Randolph & Co., 1889. Pp. xiv., 148, cloth, 50 cts.

PRENTICE, George. Wilbur Fisk. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, cloth, $1 25.

PRICE, Jacob Embury, Rev. The Book Divine; or, How Do I Know the Bible is the Word of God? New York: Hunt & Eaton. 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

PURINTON, D. B. Christian Theism: Its Claims and Sanctions New York: Putnams, 1889. Pp. vii., 303. 8vo, cloth, $1.75.

PYNCHON, Thomas Ruggles, D.D. Bishop Butler: A religious philosopher for all time. A sketch of his life, with an examination of the "Analogy," with portrait. New York: Appleton, square crown 8vo, cloth, $1.25.

RAWLINSON, George (Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford). The Story of Phœnicia. (Story of the Nations Series.) New York: Putnam's Sons, 1889. Pp. xvii., 356, illustrated 12mo, $1.50.

RAWLINSON, George. The Kings of Israel and Judah. New York: Randolph. Pp. xii., 238, $1.00.

RAYMOND, Grace. How They Kept the Faith: A Tale of the Huguenots of Languedoc. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 12mo, cloth.

READ, Lewis H. Believing and Doing. Sermons. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Pp. 345, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

REDFORD, R. A. Vox Dei. The Doctrine of the Spirit as it is set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. London: Nisbet, 1889. Pp. 312, 8vo, 6s.

RIBOT, Th. The Psychology of Attention. (Authorized translation.) Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1890. Pp. ii., 120, 12mo, 75 cts.

RIEKS, J. Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Urchristliches Lehr- und Erbauungs-buch für das christliche Haus aus dem Griech. übersetzt und erklärt. Berlin: Wiegandt, 1889. Pp. 48, 8vo, 50 pf.

RITSCHL, A. Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. 1. Bd. Die Geschichte der Lehre. 3. Aufl. Bonn: Marcus, 1889. Pp. viii., 656, 8vo, 10 mk.

ROBINSON, Charles S., D.D. Simon Peter: His Early Life and Times. New York: American Tract Society, 1889. Pp. 309, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

ROMANCE of Psalms and Hymnal, Authors and Composers. New York: James Pott & Co. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

SABATIER, A. De la vie intime des dogmes et de leur puissance d'évolution. Paris: Fischbacher. Pp. 26, Royal 8vo.

SADLIER'S Catholic Directory, Almanac and Ordo for 1890. New York: Sadlier. 12mo, paper, $1.25; cloth, $1.50.

SAMPLE, Robert F., D.D. Beacon-lights of the Reformation; or, Romanism and the Reformers. With introduction by John Hall, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, [1889]. Pp. vii., 452, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

SCHAEFER. Erklärung der zwei Briefe an die Thessalonicher und des Briefes an die Galater. Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 8vo, 5.40 mk.

SCHAFF, Philip, D.D., Prof., etc. Creed Revision in the Presbyterian Churches. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. vii., 67, 50 cts.

SEYRING, F. Die Abhängigkeit der Sprüche Salomonis Cap. i.-ix. von Hiob auf Grund der Sprachlichen und Realen. Halle: Kämmerer, 1889. 80 cts.

SIMCOX, William Henry, M.A., Rev. The Language of the New Testament. (The Theological Educator Series, Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor.) New York: Th. Whittaker. Pp. xii., 226, 12mo, 75 cts.

SIMONIN, A. H. Synthèse scientifique et philosophique. De l' unité rationnelle des croyances relativement aux notions et aux vérités universelles. Paris: Leroux, 12 mo, 1889, 4 fr.

SMITH, W. Robertson. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. 1st Series: The Fundamental Institutions. Edinburgh: Black; New York: Appleton, 1889. Pp. 488, 8vo, 15s., $4.00.

SOROF, Martin. Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte. Eine kritische Studie. Berlin: Nicolai's Verlag, 1890. Pp. 104, 8vo, 1.60 mk., 60 cts.

SPRENGER, Gustav. Darlegung der Grundsätze nach denen die syrische Ubertragung der griechischen Geoponika gearbeitet worden ist. Eine von der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Göttingen (1888) gekrönte Preisschrift. Leipzig: Dietrichs, 1890. Pp. 40, 4to, paper, 95 cts.

STAINER, Sir John. The Music of the Bible. With an account of the development of modern musical instruments from ancient types. New York: Novello, Ewer & Co. Cloth, $1.00.

STALKER, James. Imago Christi: The Example of Jesus Christ. Introduction by William M. Taylor, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Pp. 332, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

STECKELMACHER, M. (Stadtrabb.). Die Gottesidee der Offenbarung und des Heidenthums, im Lichte eines neuen Unterscheidungsmerkmals betrachtet. Eine religionsvergleichende Studie. Mannheim: Bensheimer, 1890. Pp. 102, 8vo, 2 mk., 75 cts.

STOKES, G. T., D.D. (Professor Ecclesiastical History, Dublin). Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church. A history of Ireland and Irish Christianity from the Anglo-Norman conquest to the dawn of the Reformation. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889. Crown 8vo, cloth, 9s.

SWETE, Henry Barclay, D.D. The Psalms in Greek according to the Septuagint. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge (New York: Macmillan), 1889. Pp. xiv., 415, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

SWING, David. Motives of Life. New and enlarged edition. Chicago: A. C. McClurg. Pp. 239, 16mo, $1.00.

TERTULLIANI, Qu. S. F. Opera ex recensione A. Reifferschied et G. Wissowa. Pars I. (Corp. Scrip. Eccl. Lat. xx. 1). Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. xv., 396, 8vo, 15.60 mk.

THOMASIUS, Gottfried (Professor Theology). Die christliche Dogmengeschichte als Entwicklungsgeschichte des kirchlichen Lehrbegriffs. 2. Aufl. nach des Verfassers Tode herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Bonwetsch und Seeberg. (Bd. I., 9 mk.; II., i., 5 mk.) Bd. II., ii. Erlangen & Leipzig: Böhme. 8vo, 8 mk.

TIEFENTHAL, O. S. B., Professor (Einsiedeln). Das Hohe Lied. Ausgelegt für Theologiestudierende und Theologen. Kempten: Kösel. Pp. 364, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

TURNER, F. S. The Quakers: A Study, Historical and Critical. London: Sonnenschein, 1889. Pp. 406, 8vo, 6s.

UNITARIANISM: Its Origin and History: A Course of Sixteen Lectures delivered in Channing Hall, Boston, 1888-1889. Boston: Am. Unitarian Association, 1890. Pp. xxvii., 394, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

VERNES, Maurice. Precis d'histoire Juive depuis les origines jusqu'a l'epoche Persane. V siecle avante J-C. Paris: Libraire Hachette & Cie., 1889. Pp. 828.

WACKER, E. Der Diakonissenberuf nach seiner Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Kurz dargestellt. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. iv., 211, 8vo, 2 mk.

WAKELEY, J. B., D.D. Lost Chapters Recovered from the Early History of Methodism. With a memoir of the author by the Rev. William E. Ketcham. New York: Wilbur E. Ketcham. Pp. 640, illustrated, cloth, $2.00.

WALBURG, Rev. A. H. The Question of Nationality in its Relations to the Catholic Church in the United States. St. Louis: Herder, 1889. 12mo, paper, *net*, 25 cts.

WARD, C. Osborne. A History of the Ancient Working People from the Earliest Known Period to the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine. Washington, D. C.: W. H. Lowdermilk, 1889. Pp. 519, cloth, $2.00.

WARD, Julius H. The Church in Modern Society. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, $1.00.

WARNECK, G, Dr. Die Stellung der evangelischen Mission zur Sklavenfrage, geschichtlich und theoretisch erörtert. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann. Pp. 125, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

WATTERICH, Prof. Das Passah des neuen Bundes. Eine theologische Betrachtung. Baden-Baden: Sommermeyr, 1889. Pp. viii., 120, 8vo, $1.10.

WEISS, N. La chambre ardente: étude sur la liberté de conscience en France sous François I. et Henri II. (1540–1550). Paris: Fischerbacher, 6 fr.

WEISS, Hermann. Einleitung in die christliche Ethik. Freiburg i-B.: Mohr, 1889. Pp. viii., 239, 8vo, 5 mk.

WELLHAUSEN, J. Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. 4. Heft. (1) Medina vor dem Islam. (2) Muhammad's Gemeindeordnungen von Medina. (3) Seine Schreiben und die Gesandschaften an ihn. Berlin: Reimer. Pp. 194 + 78 of Arabic text, 8vo, 9 mk.

WESTCOTT, Brooke Foss, D.D, D.C.L. The Epistle to the Hebrews. The Greek text, with notes and essays. New York: Macmillan, 8vo, $4.

WHITE, Edward (Archbishop of Canterbury). Christ and His Times. Addressed to the diocese of Canterbury in his second visitation. London and New York: Macmillan, 1890, crown 8vo, 6s.

WHITON, James Morris, Ph.D. New Points to Old Texts. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 255, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

WINDELBAND, W. (Professor, Strassburg). Geschichte der Philosophie. 1. Lieferung. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. 1–128, 8vo, 95 cts.

WOLFF, J., Prof. Dr. Das Bewusstsein und sein Object. Berlin: Mayer & Müller. Pp. xi., 620, 8vo, 12 mk.

WOLF, Edmund Jacob, D.D. The Lutherans in America. A story of struggle, progress, influence and marvellous growth. With an Introduction by Henry E. Jacobs, D.D. New York: J. A. Hill & Co. Pp. xx., 544, $2.75.

WOOLNY, F., Dr. Prolegomena der natürlichen Moral. Leipzig: Wigand. Pp. 48, 8vo, 1 mk.

WORKMAN, George Coulson, Rev. (Professor O. T. Exegesis, Victoria University, Coburg, Ont., Canada). The Text of Jeremiah; or, A Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the variations of the LXX, retranslated into the original and explained, with an introductory notice by Professor Franz Delitzsch, D.D. New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. 8vo.

WRIGHT, Joseph H., Rev. The Patience of Hope, and Other Sermons. With a brief sketch of his life. Edited by Oliver J. Thatcher. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. Pp. 224, 12mo, $1.25.

ZIMMERN, H. Die Assyriologie als Hülfswissenschaft für das Studium des Alten Testaments und des klassischen Altertums. Antritts-Vorlesung. . . . Königsberg i. Pr., November 1, 1889. Königsberg: Koch, 1889. Pp. 22, 8vo, 25 cts.

ZÖCKLER, Otto (Hrsgr). Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften in encykl. Darstellung. 3. Aufl. Bd. 4. Praktische Theol. München: Beck. Pp. viii, 660, 8vo, 10 mk.

The Editor of the Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge returns his thanks to the correspondent who kindly pointed out the typographical error on p. 127, col. 1, l. 33; r. Lyme for Lynn.

Harper's for February opens with an article on "The Standing Army of Great Britain," by General Viscount Wolseley, in which it is said that Cromwell's standing army of about 80,000 men was by far "the finest in every respect that we know of in modern history." There is a spirited picture of Cromwell at Marston Moor. The illustrations are particularly good. The present British army numbers 211,207. The article on Benvenuto Cellini will interest a different class For his "Perseus," his masterpiece, he received only 3500 crowns, whereas it was estimated to be worth 16,000. "Jamaica, New and Old," by Howard Pyle, is a continuation of that in the January number. "The Lake Dwellers," by S. H. M. Byers, does full justice to Professor Ferdinand Keller, to whom we are indebted for our knowledge of those pre-historic folk. The illustrations include a portrait of Keller, an ideal view of a lake village and pictures of many implements, etc. The lake villages existed on all the Swiss lakes, but they left no written history. Mr. George Parsons Lathrop recounts some of his "Talks with Edison," in which we learn much about Mr. Edison's early life. The invention which cost him most study and experimentation was the electric light. He said once, "The existence of an intelligent Creator, a personal God, can, to my mind, almost be proved from chemistry." Mark Twain dwells characteristically upon "A Majestic Literary Fossil"—Dr. James' *Dictionary of Medicine*, published in London in 1745. "Nights and Days with De Quincey," by James Hogg, is a timely article in view of the new edition of De Quincey now appearing. Everything relating to that remarkable man is welcome, and Mr. Hogg helps us understand him, as only he can who knew De Quincey personally and intimately. Mr. Richard Wheatley has an article on "New York Banks." The other departments of this uniformly excellent magazine present their usual variety. Mr. Curtis, in the Easy Chair, has a bright little essay on the Shakers.

The Atlantic Monthly for February is filled with interesting matter. Those who have followed Dr. Holmes through his literary career—and what lover of literature has not ?—will read with delight his third paper in the "Over the Teacups" series, in which he demonstrates with characteristic wit, the moral fallacies of Mr. Bellamy's theories. Francis A. Walker combats these theories also in an article entitled "Mr. Bellamy and the New Nationalist Party." Charles B. Elliott discusses the Fishery question; Mr. K. Kaneko, the head of the Japanese Commission which has been visiting this country, contributes a paper on "An Outline of the Japanese Constitution;" Mr. Lowell's book on Isaac Walton is reviewed: and Mr. John T. Morse treats Davis's "Recollections of Mississippi" under the title "One of the Unconstructed." Henry James, Margaret Deland and Mr. Bynner contribute fiction instalments; and there are the usual poems, reviews (including a valuable one on "Browning's Energy") and racy talk in the "Contributor's Club" columns.

Lippincott's for February opens with a novel by A. Conan Doyle, "The Sign of the Four;" Julian Hawthorne contributes his second paper on "Nathaniel Hawthorne's 'Elixir of Life,'" describing the *method* of his father's work, and incidentally reciting much of his original writings subsequently changed for publication; and there are articles by Francis Galton, F.R.S., C H. Herford, A. E. Watrous, John Habberton and others; with book reviews (in which department this magazine is exceptionally strong) by William S. Walsh, Melville Philips, Maurice F. Egan, Charles Morris, and H. C. Walsh.

The biographer of the late John Ericsson, Colonel W. C. Church, contributes the first of two illustrated articles on the great engineer to the February Scribner, which is an unusually interesting number even of this always interesting magazine. W. H. Mallock writes an article on Hungarian castles. Herbert Ward has a paper entitled "Life Among the Congo Savages," curiously illustrated, and of value as affording a comprehensive description of the manners and customs of the strange people found by Stanley in his march into the African interior. William Henry Bishop and Eugene Schuyler are contributors to this number, and President Wright, of Oberlin, writes a geological monograph. T. R. Sullivan has one of his remarkable short stories, entitled "Through the Gate of Dreams."

The Missionary Review of the World for February opens with an excellent article by Rev James Johnston, of London, "Protestant Missions a Hundred Years Ago and Now." Next comes an account of Dr. Pierson's missionary crusade in Scotland, which is followed by Rev. Dr. Bradford's article, out of place in this magazine, on the charities of Germany. But the most valuable article is on "The Jubilee of the New Hebrides Mission," by Rev. Dr. Robert Steel, of Sydney, New South Wales. It contains sketches of the heroes of this mission. Rev. J. Hudson Taylor calls once more for help in the Inland Mission in China; Rev. Secretary Dr. Ellinwood shows up the credulity of scepticism. Rev. Paul de Schweinit (*sic*) tells of the Moravian mission on the Kuskokwim in Alaska, and shows that "missionary heroism has not yet gone out of date." Mr. Starbuck gives his able condensed translations of the foreign missionary journals. This is one of the most interesting features of the Review. The other departments are filled as usual.

THE

MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

VOL. 1. MARCH, 1890. No. 6.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

1549–1880.

BY REV. WILLIAM R. HUNTINGTON, D.D., RECTOR OF GRACE CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY.

"CERTAIN of the necromancers of the far East are said to have the power of causing a tree to spring up, spread its branches, blossom and bear fruit before the eyes of the lookers-on within the space of a few moments.

Modern liturgies have sometimes been brought into being by a process as extemporaneous as this, but not such was the genesis of the Book of Common Prayer.

There are at least eight forms under which the Prayer-book has been from time to time authoritatively set forth—five English, one Scottish, one Irish, and one American ; so that, if we would be accurate, we are bound to specify when we speak of "The Prayer-book," which of several Prayer-books we have in mind.

The truth is, there exists in connection with everything that grows, whether it be plant, animal, or building, a certain mystery like that which attaches to what, in the case of a man, we call personal identity. Which is the true, the actual Napoleon ? Is it the Napoleon of the Directory, or the Napoleon of the Consulate, or the Napoleon of the Empire ? At each epoch we discern a different phase of the man's character, and yet we are compelled to acknowledge in face of all the variations that we have to do with one and the same man.

But just as a ship acquires, as we may say, her identity when she is launched and named, even though there may be a great deal yet to be done in the way of finishing and furnishing before she can be pronounced seaworthy, so it is with a book that is destined to undergo repeated revision and reconstruction, it does acquire, on the day when it is first published, and first given a distinctive title, a certain character the losing of which would be the loss of identity. There is many an old cathedral that might properly enough be called a re-edited book in stone. Norman architecture, early English, decorated and perpendicular, all are there, and yet one dominant thought pervades the building. Notwithstanding the many times it has been retouched, the fabric still expresses to the eye the original creative purpose of the designer ; there is no possibility of our mistaking Salisbury for York or Peterborough for Lincoln.

The first Book of Common Prayer was built up of blocks that for the most part had been previously used in other buildings, but the resulting structure exhibited, from the very moment it received a name, such distinct and unmistakable characteristics as have guaranteed it personal identity through more than three hundred years. Hence, while it is in one sense true that there are no fewer than eight books of Common Prayer, it is in another sense equally true that the Book of Common Prayer is one.

An identity of purpose, of scope, and of spirit shows itself in all of the various forms under which the book exists, so that whether we are speaking of the first Prayer-book of King Edward the Sixth, or of the book adopted by the Church of Ireland after its disestablishment, or of the American Book of Common Prayer, what we have in mind is in a very real and deep sense one and the same thing.

Let us proceed now to a rapid survey of the facts connected with the first issue of the Common Prayer.

For a period long anterior to the Reformation there had been in use among the English brief books of devotion known as "primers," written in the language of the people. The fact that the public services of the Church were invariably conducted in the Latin tongue made a resort to such expedients as this necessary, unless religion were to be reserved as the private property of ecclesiastics.

By a curious process of evolution the primer from having been in mediæval times a book wholly religious and devotional, has come to be in our day a book wholly secular and educational. We associate it with Noah Webster and the Harper Brothers. The New England Primer of the Puritans, with its odd jumble of piety and the three R's, marks a point of transition from the ancient to the modern type.

But this by the way. The primer we are now concerned with is the devotional primer of the times just previous to the Reformation. This, as a rule, contained prayers, the Belief, the Ave Maria, a litany of some sort, the Ten Commandments, and whatever else there might be that in the mind of the compiler came under the head of "things which a Christian ought to know." There were three of these primers set forth during the reign of Henry the Eighth, one in 1535, one in 1539, and one in 1545. During the space that intervened between the publication of the second and that of the third of these primers, appeared "The Litany and Suffrages," a formulary compiled, as is generally believed, by Cranmer, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, and in substance identical with the Litany we use to-day. This Litany of 1544 has been properly described as "the precursor and first instalment of the English Book of Common Prayer." It was the nucleus or centre of crystallization about which the other constituent portions of our manual of worship were destined to be grouped. A quaint exhortation was prefixed to this Litany, in which it is said to have been set forth "because the not understanding the prayers and suffrages formerly used caused that the people came but slackly to the processions." Besides the primers and the Litany, there were printed in Henry's reign various editions of a book of Epistles and Gospels in English. There was also published a Psalter in Latin and English.

All this looked rather to the edification of individual Christians in their private devotional life than to the public worship of the Church, but we are not to suppose that meanwhile the larger interests of the whole body were forgotten. So early as in the year 1542 Convocation, which according to the Anglican theory stands toward the Church in the same attitude that Parliament holds to the State, appointed a Committee of Eight to review and correct the existing service-books. We know very little as to the proceedings of this committee, but that something was done, and a real impulse given to liturgical revision, is evidenced by the fact that at a meeting of Convocation held soon after King Henry's death a resolution prevailed "That the books of the Bishops and others who by the command of the Convocation have labored in examining, reforming, and publishing the divine service may be produced and laid before the examination of this house."

The next important step in the process we are studying was the publication by authority in the early spring of 1548, of an Order of the Communion, as it was called, a formulary prepared by Cranmer to enable the priest after having consecrated the elements in the usual manner, to distribute them to the people with the sentences of delivery spoken in English. The priest, that is to say, was to proceed with the service of the mass as usual in the Latin tongue, but after he had himself received the bread and the wine, he was to proceed to a service of Communion for the people in a speech they could understand.

Almost everything in this tentative document, as we may call it, was subsequently incorporated in the Office of the Holy Communion as we are using it to-day.

We have, then, as an abiding result of the liturgical experiments made in anticipation of the actual setting forth of an authoritative Prayer-book, the Litany and this Order of the Communion.

The time was now ripe for something better and more complete; a new king was upon the throne, and one whose counsellors were better disposed toward change than ever Henry had been. The great movement we know under the name of the Reformation touched the life of the Christian Church in every one of its three great departments—doctrine, discipline, and worship. In Henry's mind, however, the question appears to have been almost exclusively one of discipline or polity. His quarrel was not with the accepted theological errors of his day, for as Defender of the Faith he covered some of the worst of them with his shield. Neither was he ill-disposed toward the methods and usages of public worship so far as we can judge. His quarrel first, last, and always was with a certain rival claimant of power, whose pretended authority he was determined to drive out of the realm, to wit, the Pope. But while it was thus with Henry, it was far otherwise with many of the more thoughtful and devout among his theologians, and when the restraint that had been laid on them was removed by the King's death, they welcomed the opportunity to apply to doctrine and worship the same reforming touch that had already remoulded polity.

An enlarged Committee of Convocation sat at Windsor in the summer of 1548, and as a result there was finally set forth, and ordered to be put into use on Whit-Sunday, 1549, what has become known in history as the "First Prayer-book of Edward VI."

To dwell on those features of the First Book that have remained unaltered to the present day would be superfluous, I shall therefore, in speaking of it, confine myself to the distinctive and characteristic points in which it differs from the prayer-books that have succeeded it.

It is worthy of note that in the title-page of the First Book there is a clear distinction drawn between the Church Universal, or what we call in the *Te Deum* "the holy Church throughout all the world," and that particular church to which King Edward's subjects, in virtue of their being Englishmen, belonged. The book is said to be "the Book of the Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of THE CHURCH, after the use of the Church of England." "THE CHURCH" is recognized as being a larger and, perhaps, older thing than the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, while at the same time it is intimated that only through such *use* of these same prayers and sacraments as the English Church ordains and authorizes can English folk come into communion with the great family of believers spread over the whole earth.

The Preface is a singularly racy piece of English in which with the utmost plainness of speech the compilers give their reasons for having dealt with the old services as they have done. This reappears in the English Prayer-book of the present day under the title "Concerning the Service of the Church," and so described is placed after the Preface written in 1662 by the Revisers of the Restoration.

The Order for Daily Morning Prayer, as we name it, is called in Edward's First Book "An Order for Matins daily through the year." Similarly, what we call the Order for Daily Evening Prayer was styled "An Order for Even-song." These beautiful names, "Matins" and "Even-song," which it is a great pity to have lost, for surely there is nothing superstitious about them, disappeared from the book as subsequently revised, and save in the Lectionary of the Church of England have no present recognition. One of them, however, Even-song, seems to be coming very generally into colloquial use. The Order for Matins began with the Lord's Prayer. Then, after the familiar versicles still in use, including two that have no place in our American book, "O God make speed to save me. O Lord make haste to help me," there followed in full the 95th Psalm, a portion of which is known to us as the *Venite*. From this point the service proceeded, as in the English Prayer-book of to day, through the Collect for Grace, where it came to an end. The structure of Even-song was similar, beginning with the Lord's Prayer and ending, as our shortened Evening Prayer now does, with the Collect for Aid against Perils. Then followed the Athanasian Creed, and immediately afterward came the Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels.

These Introits, so-called, were psalms appointed to be sung when the priest was about to begin the Holy Communion. They had been an ancient feature of divine service, but were dropped from the subsequent books as a required feature of the Church's worship.

The title of the Communion Service in Edward's First Book is as follows: "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion commonly called the Mass." Immediately after the Prayer for Purity—*i.e.*, in the place where we have the Ten Commandments comes the *Gloria in Excelsis*. The service then proceeds very much as with us, except that the Prayer for the Church Militant and the Consecration Prayer are welded into one, and the Prayer of Humble Access given a place immediately before the reception of the elements. I note, in passing, certain phrases and sentences that are peculiar to the Communion Office of the First Book, as, for instance, this from the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church. "And here we do give unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints from the beginning of the world, and chiefly in the most glorious and blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of thy Son Jesu Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose examples, O Lord, and steadfastness in thy faith and keeping thy holy commandments grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith and do now rest in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them we beseech thee thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son may altogether be set on His right hand."

And this from the closing portion of the Consecration. "Yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of thy holy angels to be brought up into thy holy tabernacle before the sight of thy divine majesty."

Following close upon the Communion Service came the Litany, differing very little from what we have to-day, save in the memorable petition "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, Good Lord deliver us."

The Baptismal Offices of the First Book contain certain unique features. The sign of the cross is ordered to be made on the child's breast as well as on his forehead. There is a form of exorcism said over the infant in which the unclean spirit is commanded to come out and to depart. There is also the giving of the "Crisome" or white vesture as a symbol of innocence. "Take this white vesture for a token of the innocency, which by God's grace in this holy sacrament of Baptism is given unto thee, and for a sign whereby thou art admonished, so long as thou livest, to give thyself to innocency of living, that after this transitory life thou mayest be partaker of the life everlasting."

The Catechism in Edward VI. First Book, as in the subsequent books down to 1662, is made a part of the Confirmation Office, although it does not clearly appear that the children were expected to say it as a preliminary to the service.

The Office for the Visitation of the Sick contains provision for private confession and absolution, and also directs that the priest shall anoint the sick man with oil if he be desired to do so.

The Office for the Communion of the Sick allows the practice of what is called the reservation of the elements, but contains also, be it observed, that rubric which has held its place through all the changes the Prayer-book has undergone, where we are taught that if the sick man by any "just impediment fail to receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the curate shall instruct him that if he do truly repent him of his sins and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him . . . he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, profitably to his soul's health although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth."

Such is the testimony of Edward VI.'s First Book to the truly spiritual character of Holy Communion considered in its essence. Imagine the measure of success that would be likely to attend an attempt to secure the insertion of such a rubric in the Prayer-book to-day, supposing it never to have had a place there!

The Burial Office contains a recognition of prayer for the dead, but except in the matter of the arrangement of the parts differs but little from the service still in use. A special Introit, Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are appointed "for the Celebration of the Holy Communion when there is a Burial of the Dead."

A Commination Office for Ash-Wednesday, substantially identical with that still in use in the Church of England, concludes the book.

The First Prayer-book of King Edward the Sixth, memorable as it was destined to become, proved, so far as actual use was concerned, but short-lived. It became operative, as we have seen, on Whit-Sunday, 1549, but it was soon evident that while the new services went too far in the direction of reform to please the friends of the ancient order of things, they did not go far enough to meet the wishes of the reforming party.

Before the year was out no fewer than three translations of the Liturgy into Latin had been undertaken with a view to informing the Protestant divines of the Continent as to what their English colleagues were doing. "There was already within the Church" (of England), writes Cardwell, in his comparison of Edward's two books, "a party, though probably not numerous, which espoused the peculiar sentiments of Calvin; there were others, and Cranmer, it appears, had recently been one of them, adhering strictly to the opinions of Luther; there were many, and those among the most active and the most learned, who adopted the views of Bullinger and the theologians of Zurich; there was a still larger body anxious to combine all classes of Protestants under one general confession, and all these, though with distinct objects and different degrees of impatience, looked forward to a revision of the Liturgy, to bring it more completely into accordance with their own sentiments."

As a result of the agitation thus vividly pictured by Cardwell, there came forth in 1552 the book known as the Second Prayer-book of King Edward VI., a work of the very greatest interest, for the reason that it was destined to become the basis of all future revisions. Whit-Sunday, 1549, was the day when the First Book began to be used. The Feast of All Saints, 1552, was the date officially appointed for the introduction of the Second Book. Presently King Edward died, and by an act of Mary passed in October, 1553, the use of his book became illegal on and after December 20th of that year. It thus appears that the First Book was in use for two years and about four months, and the Second Book one year and about two months. A memorable three years and a half for the English-speaking peoples of all time to come, for it is not too much to say that while the language of Tyndale and of Cranmer continues to be heard on earth, the devotions then put into form will keep on moulding the religious thought and firing the spiritual imagination of this race.

The points in which the second of King Edward's two books differs from the first are of such serious moment and the general complexion of the later work has in it such an access of Protestant coloring, that high Anglican writers have been in the habit of attributing the main features of the revision to the interference of the Continental Reformers. "If it had not been for the impertinent meddling," they have been accustomed to say, "of such foreigners as Bucer, Peter Martyr, and John a-Lasco, we might have been enjoying at the present day the admirable and truly Catholic devotions set forth in the fresh morning of the Reformation before the earth-born vapors of theological controversy and ecclesiastical partizanship had beclouded an otherwise fair sky." But it does not appear that there is any solid foundation, in fact, for these complaints.

The natural spread of the spirit of reform among the people of the realm taken in connection with the changes of opinion which the swift movement of the times necessarily engendered in the minds of the leading divines are of themselves quite sufficient to account for what took place. Certainly, if the English of that day were at all like their descendants in our time, it is in the highest degree unlikely that they would have allowed a handful of learned refugees to force upon them changes which their own sober judgment did not approve.

The truth is, very little is certainly known as to the details of what was done in the making of Edward's Second Book. Even the names of the members of the committee intrusted with the revision are matter of conjecture, and of the proceedings of that body no authentic record survives. What we do possess and are in a position to criticise is the book itself, and to a brief review of the points in which it differs from its predecessor we will now pass.

Upon taking up the Second Book after laying down the First, one is struck immediately with the changed look of Morning Prayer. This is no longer called Matins, and no longer begins as before with the Lord's Prayer. An Introduction has been prefixed to the office consisting of a collection of sentences from Holy Scripture, all of them of a penitential character, and besides these of an Exhortation, a Confession, and an Absolution. There can be little doubt that this opportunity for making public acknowledgment of sin and hearing the declaration of God's willingness to forgive, was meant to counterbalance the removal from the book of all reference, save in one instance, to private confession and absolution. The Church of England has always retained in her Visitation Office a permission to the priest to pronounce absolution privately to the sick man. This was a feature of the First Book that was not disturbed in the second. But wherever else they found anything that seemed to look toward the continuance of the system familiarly known to us under the name of "the Confessional," they expunged it. Between the Exhortation and the Confession there is, in point of literary merit, a noticeable contrast, and it is scarcely to be believed that both formularies can have proceeded from one and the same pen. Another step in the Protestant direction was the prohibition of certain vestments that in the First Book had been allowed, as the alb and cope. The Introit Psalms were taken away. The word "table" was everywhere substituted for the word "altar." The changes in the Office of the Holy Communion were numerous and significant. The Ten Commandments, for instance, were inserted in the place where we now have them. The *Gloria in Excelsis* was transferred from the beginning of the service to the end. The Exhortations were re-written. The supplication for the dead was taken out of the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, and the words "militant here on earth" were added to the title with a view to confining the scope of the intercession to the circle of people still alive. The Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, and Prayer of Humble Access were placed before the Consecration instead of after it. Most important of all was the change of the words appointed to be said in delivering the elements to the communicants. In the First Book there had been "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life," and in the case of the cup, "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." For these were now substituted in the one instance the words "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving," and in the other, "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."

From the Office for the Communion of the Sick the direction to reserve the elements was omitted, as was also the permission to anoint the sick man with oil. The Service of Baptism was no longer suffered to retain the exorcism of the evil spirit, or the white vesture, or the unction; and there were other items of less important change.

Those mentioned reveal plainly enough what was the animus of the revisers. Most evidently the intention was to produce a liturgy more thoroughly reformed, more in harmony with the new tone and temper which the religious thought of the times was taking on.

We come to the Third Book of Common Prayer. Bloody Mary was dead, and Elizabeth had succeeded to the throne.

During the Roman reaction proclamation had been made that all the Reformed service-books should be given up to the ecclesiastical authorities within fifteen days to be burned. This is doubtless the reason why copies of the liturgical books of Edward's reign are now so exceedingly rare. Reprints of them abound, but the originals exist only as costly curiosities.

Soon after Elizabeth's accession a committee of divines assembled under her authority for the purpose of again revising the formularies.

The Queen was personally a High-Churchwoman, and her own judgment is said to have been favorable to taking the first of Edward's two books as the basis of the revision, but a contrary preference swayed the committee, and the lines followed were those of 1552 and not those of 1549.

The new features distinctive of the Prayer-book of Elizabeth, otherwise known as the Prayer-book of 1559, are not numerous. A table of Proper Lessons for Sundays was introduced. The old vestments recognized in the earlier part of King Edward's reign were again legalized. The petition for deliverance from the tyranny of the Pope was struck out of the Litany, and by a compromise peculiarly English in its character, and, as experience has shown, exceedingly well judged, the two forms of words that had been used in the delivery of the elements in the Holy Communion were welded together into the shape in which we have them still. An interesting tradition survives in the English Church to the effect that Pope Pius the Fourth was willing to make peace with Elizabeth on the basis of this Prayer-book of hers if only she would consent to acknowledge his supremacy.

Sir Edward Coke declares upon his honor ("as I have faith to God and man" are his words), that the Holy Father wrote a letter to her Majesty "in which he did allow the Bible and Book of Divine Service, as it is now used among us, to be authentic and not repugnant to truth. But that therein was contained enough necessary to salvation, though there was not so much in it as might conveniently be, and such he would also allow it unto us without changing any part; so as her Majesty would acknowledge to receive it from the Pope and by his allowance, which her Majesty denying to do she was then presently by the same Pope excommunicated. . . . I have oftentimes" adds Sir Edward, "heard avowed by the late Queen her own words, and I have conferred with some Lords that were of greatest reckoning in the State who had seen and read the letter which the Pope sent to that effect; as have been by me specified. And this upon my credit, as I am an honest man is most true."

Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-book continued in use for five-and-forty years.

Nothing was more natural than that when she died there should come with the accession of a new dynasty a demand for fresh revision.

King James, who was not afflicted with any want of confidence in his own judgment, invited certain representatives of the disaffected party to meet, under his presidency, the Churchmen in council with a view to the settlement of differences. The Puritans had been gaining in strength during Elizabeth's reign, and they felt that they were now in position to demand a larger measure of liturgical reform than that monarch and her advisers had been willing to concede to them.

King James convened his Conference at Hampton Court, near London, and he himself was good enough to preside. Very little came of the debate. The Puritans had demanded the discontinuance of the sign of the cross in Baptism, of bowing at the name of Jesus, of the ring in marriage, and of the rite of confirmation. The words "priest" and "absolution" they sought to have expunged from the Prayer-book, and they desired that the wearing of the surplice should be made optional.

Almost nothing was conceded to them. The words "or Remission of Sins" were added to the title of the Absolution, certain

Prayers and Thanksgivings were introduced, and that portion of the Catechism which deals with the Sacraments was for the first time set forth. And thus the English Prayer-book started out upon its fourth lease of life destined in this form to endure unchanged, though by no means unassailed, for more than half a century.

A stirring half century it was. The Puritan defeat at Hampton Court was redressed at Naseby. With the coming in of the Long Parliament the Book of Common Prayer went out, and to all appearances the triumph of the commonwealth meant the final extinction of the usage of liturgical worship on English soil. The book, under its various forms, had lasted just a hundred years when he who

"Nothing common did or mean
Upon that memorable scene"

suffered at Whitehall.

They buried him in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and no single word of the Prayer-book he had loved and for which he had fought was said over his grave.

On January 3d, 1645, Parliament repealed the statutes of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth that had enjoined the use of the Book of Common Prayer, and took order that thereafter only such divine service should be lawful as accorded with what was called the Directory, a manual of suggestions with respect to public worship adopted by the Presbyterian party as a substitute for the ancient liturgy.

With the restoration of the Stuarts in 1660 came naturally the restoration of the Prayer-book, and with equal naturalness a revision of it. But of what sort should the revision be, and under whose auspices conducted? This was an anxious question for the advisers, civil and ecclesiastical, of the restored King. Should the second Charles take up the book just as it had fallen from the hands of the first Charles, unchanged in line or letter, or should he seek by judicious alterations and timely concessions to win back for the national Church the good-will and loyalty of those who, eighteen years before, had broken down her hedge? The situation may be described as triangular.

The King's secret and personal sympathies were probably all along with the Roman Church; his official allegiance was plainly due to the Church of England, and yet, at the same time, he owed much to the forbearance of the men who had been dominant under the Commonwealth. The mind of the nation had, indeed, re-acted towards monarchy, but not with such an absolute and hearty renunciation of the doctrines of popular sovereignty as to make it safe for the returning King to do precisely as he chose. The glorious Revolution that was destined so soon to follow upon the heels of the gracious Restoration gave evidence, when it came, that there were some things the people of England prized even more highly than an hereditary throne. Misgivings as to the amount there might still be of this sort of electricity in the atmosphere suggested to the King and his counsellors the expediency of holding a conference, at which the leaders on either side might bring forward their strong reasons in favor of this or that method of dealing with the ecclesiastical question in general, and more especially with the vexed problem of worship.

Accordingly, early in the spring of 1661 the King issued a royal warrant summoning to meet at the Savoy Palace in the Strand an equal number of representatives of both parties—namely, one-and-twenty Churchmen and one-and-twenty Presbyterians.

The Episcopal deputation consisted of twelve bishops and nine other divines called coadjutors. The Presbyterians had also their twelve principal men and their nine coadjutors.

Conspicuous among the Episcopalians for weight of learning were Bishops Sanderson, Cosin, and Walton, and Doctors Pearson, Sparrow, and Heylin. Baxter, Reynolds, Calamy, and Lightfoot were the most notable of the Presbyterians.

The conference, which has ever since been known from its place of meeting (an old palace of the Piedmontese Ambassadors) as the Savoy Conference, convened on April 15th, 1661. For various reasons, it was evident from the outset that the Churchmen were in a position of great advantage. In the first place, signs and tokens of a renewed confidence in monarchy and of a revived attachment to the reigning House were becoming daily more numerous.

Before he had had a chance to test the strength of the existing political parties and to know how things really stood, Charles had borne himself very discreetly toward the Presbyterians, and had held out hopes to them which, as the event proved, were destined never to be realized. In a declaration put forth in the autumn of 1660, after he had been for some months on English soil, he had even gone so far as to say "When we were in Holland we were attended by many grave and learned ministers from hence, who were looked upon as the most able and principal assertors of the Presbyterian opinions; with whom we had as much conference as the multitude of affairs which were then upon us would permit us to have, and to our great satisfaction and comfort found them persons full of affection to us, of zeal for the peace of the Church and State, and neither enemies, as they have been given out to be, to episcopacy or liturgy, but modestly to desire such alterations in either, as without shaking foundations might best allay the present distempers."

By the time the conference met it had become evident, from votes taken in Parliament and otherwise, that the Churchmen could sustain toward their opponents a somewhat stiffer attitude than this without imperilling their cause. Another great advantage enjoyed by the Episcopalians grew out of the fact that they were the party in possession. They had only to profess themselves satisfied with the Prayer-book as it stood, in order to throw the Presbyterians into the position of assailants, and defence is always easier than attack. Sheldon, the Bishop of London, was not slow to perceive this. At the very first meeting of the conference, he is reported to have said that "as the Nonconformists, and not the bishops, had sought for the conference, nothing could be done till the former had delivered their exceptions in writing, together with the additional forms and alterations which they desired." Upon which Bishop Burnet in his *History of his own Times*, remarks: "Sheldon saw well what the effect would be of putting them to make all their demands at once. The number of them raised a mighty outcry against them, as people that could never be satisfied."

The Presbyterians, however, took up the challenge, set to work at formulating their objections, and appointed Richard Baxter, the most famous of their number, to show what could be done in the way of making a better manual of worship than the Book of Common Prayer.

Baxter, a truly great man and wise in a way, though scarcely in the liturgical way, was guilty of the incredible folly of undertaking to construct a Prayer-book within a fortnight.

Of this liturgy it is probably safe to say that no denomination of Christians, however anti-prelatical or eccentric would for a moment dream of adopting it, if, indeed, there be a single local congregation anywhere that could be persuaded to employ it. The characteristic of the devotions is lengthiness. The opening sentence of the prayer with which the book begins contains by actual count eighty-three words. It is probable that Baxter by his rash act did more to injure the cause of intelligent and reverential liturgical revision than any ten men have done before or since. In every discussion of the subject he is almost sure to be brought forward as "the awful example."

A document much more to the point than Baxter's Liturgy was the formal catalogue of faults and blemishes alleged against the Prayer-book, which the Puritan members of the conference in due time brought in. This indictment, for it may fairly be called such, since it was drawn up in separate counts, is very interesting reading. Of the "exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer," as the Puritans named their list of liturgical grievances, some must strike almost any reader of the present day as trivial and unworthy. Others again there are that draw a sympathetic *Amen* from many quarters to-day. To an American Episcopalian the catalogue is chiefly interesting as showing how ready and even eager were our colonial ancestors of a hundred years ago to remove out of the way such known rocks of offence as they could. An attentive student of the American Prayer-book cannot fail to be struck with the number of instances in which the text gives evidence of the influence exerted over the minds of our revisers by what had been urged, more than a hundred years before, by the Puritan members of the Savoy Conference. The defeat of 1661 was in a measure, at least, avenged in 1789. It is encouraging to those who cast their bread upon liturgical waters, to notice after how many days the return may come. But the conference, to all outward seeming, was a failure. Baxter's unhappy Prayer-book was its own sufficient refutation, and as for the list of special grievances it was met by the Bishops with an "Answer" that was full of hard raps and conceded almost nothing.

A few detached paragraphs may serve to illustrate the general tone of this reply. Here, for instance, is the comment of the Bishops upon the request of the Puritans to be allowed occasionally to substitute extemporaneous for liturgical devotions. "The gift or rather spirit of prayer consists in the inward graces of the spirit, not in extempore expressions which any man of natural parts having a voluble tongue and audacity may attain to without any special gift." Nothing very conciliatory in that. To the complaint that the collects are too short, the Bishops reply that they cannot for that reason be accounted faulty, being like those "short but prevalent prayers in Scripture, Lord, be merciful to me a sinner. Lord, increase our faith." The Puritans had objected to the antiphonal element in the Prayer-book services, and desired to have nothing of a responsive character allowed beyond the single word *Amen.* "But," rejoin the Bishops, "they directly practice the contrary in one of their principal parts of worship, singing of psalms, where the people bear as great a part as the minister. If this way be done in Hopkins's why not in David's Psalms; if in metre, why not in prose; if in a psalm, why not in a litany?" Sharp but not winning.

The Puritans had objected to the people's kneeling while the Commandments were read on the score that ignorant worshippers might mistake the Decalogue for a form of prayer. With some asperity the Bishops reply that "why Christian people should not upon their knees ask their pardon for their life forfeited for the breach of every commandment and pray for grace to keep them for the time to come they must be more than 'ignorant' that can scruple."

The time during which the conference at the Savoy should continue its sessions had been limited to four months. This period expired on July 24th, 1661, and the apparently fruitless disputation was at an end. Meanwhile, however, Convocation, the recognized legislature of the Church of England, had begun to sit, and the Bishops had undertaken a revision of the Prayer-book after their own mind, and with slight regard to what they had been hearing from their critics at the Savoy. The bulk of their work, which included, it is said, more than six hundred alterations, most of them of a verbal character and of no great importance, was accomplished within the compass of a single month. It is consoling to those who within our own memory have been charged with indecent haste for seeking to effect a revision of the American Book of Common Prayer within a period of nine years to find this precedent in ecclesiastical history for their so great rashness.

Since Charles the Second's day there has been no formal revision of the Prayer-book of the Church of England by the Church of England.

Some slight relaxations of liturgical use on Sundays have been made legal by Act of Parliament, but in all important respects the Prayer-book of Victoria is identical with the book set forth by Convocation and sanctioned by Parliament shortly after the collapse of the Savoy Conference. Under no previous lease of life did the book enjoy anything like so long a period of continued existence. Elizabeth's book was the longest lived of all that preceded the Restoration, but that only continued in use five-and-forty years. But the Prayer-book of 1661 has now held its own in England for two centuries and a quarter. When, therefore, we are asked to accept the first Edwardian Book as the only just exponent of the religious mind of England, it is open to us to reply, "Why should we, seeing that the Caroline Book has served as the vehicle of English devotion for a period seventy-five times as long?" The most voluminous of the additions made to the Prayer-book, in 1661, were the Office for the Baptism of Adults and the Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea. The wide diffusion, under the Commonwealth, of what were then called Anabaptist opinions, had brought it to pass that throughout the kingdom there were thousands of men and women who had grown up unbaptized. At the time of the Reformation such a thing as an unchristened Christendom seems not to have been thought possible. At any rate no provision was made for the contingency. But upon the spread of liberty of religious thought there followed, logically enough, the spread of liberty of religious action, and it was not strange that after a whole generation had spent its life in controversy of the warmest sort over this very point of Baptism, there were found to be in England multitudes of the unbaptized.

Another reason assigned in the Preface of the English Prayer-book, for the addition of this office was that it might be used for the baptizing of "natives in the plantations and other converts." This is the first hint of any awakening of the conscience of the English Church to a sense of duty toward those strangers and foreigners who in the "Greater Britain" of these later days fill so large a place. The composition of the office, which differs very little, perhaps scarcely enough, from that appointed for the Baptism of Infants, is attributed to Griffith, the Bishop of St. Asaph. The compiler of the Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea was Bishop Sanderson, famous among English theologians as an authority on casuistry. He must have found it rather a nice case of conscience to decide whether a Stuart divine in preparing forms of prayer for a navy that had been the creation of Oliver Cromwell ought wholly to omit an acknowledgment of the nation's obligation to that stout-hearted, if non-Episcopal Christian. Other additions of importance made at this revision were the General Thanksgiving, in all probability the work of Reynolds, a conforming Presbyterian divine, the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Sixth Sunday after the Epiphany, the Prayer for Parliament, upon the lines of which our own Prayer for Congress was afterward modelled, and the Prayer for All Sorts and Conditions of Men. In the Litany the words "rebellion" and "schism" were introduced into one of the suffrages, becoming tide-marks of the havoc wrought in Church and State by what the revisers, doubtless, looked back upon as "the flood of the ungodly." The words "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" were substituted for "Bishops, Pastors, and Ministers of the Church." New collects were appointed for the Third Sunday in Advent and for St. Stephen's Day. Both of these are distinct gains, albeit had the opinion then prevailed that to introduce into the Prayer-book anything from the pen of a living writer is an impiety, we should have gained neither of them.

Another important change made in 1662 was the adoption for the Sentences, Epistles and Gospels of the language of King James's Bible in place of that of earlier versions. This principle was not applied to the Psalter, to the Decalogue, or, in fact, to any of the portions of Scripture contained in the Communion Service.

It is also interesting to note that the Confession in the Holy Communion, which the earlier rubric had directed should be said by one of the congregation, or else by one of the ministers, or by the priest himself, "was now made general and enjoined upon all the worshippers."

Most suggestive of all, however, was the reinsertion at the end of the Communion Service of a certain Declaration about the significance of the act of kneeling at the reception of the elements, which had, as some say, irregularly and without proper authority, found its way into the Second Book of Edward VI., but had been omitted from all subsequent books till now. This Declaration, which from its not being printed in red ink is known to those who dislike it under the name of "the black rubric," was undoubtedly intended to ease the consciences of those who scrupled to kneel at the altar-rail for fear of seeming to countenance that superstitious adoration of the elements known to and stigmatized by the Reformers as "host-worship." The language of the black rubric as it stood in Edward's Second Book was as follows: "Although no order can be so perfectly devised but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity, or else of malice and obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved, and interpreted in a wrong part; and yet because brotherly charity willeth that so much as conveniently may be offences should be taken away; therefore we willing to do the same: whereas, it is ordained in the Book of Common Prayer, in the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants kneeling should receive the Holy Communion, which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder, which about the Holy Communion might else ensue, lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise; we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians: and as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here, for it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body to be in more places than in one at one time."

In restoring this significant Declaration. the revisers of 1662 substituted the words "corporal presence" for the words "real and substantial presence," but probably with no intention other than that of making the original meaning more plain. The fact that in the teeth and eyes of the black rubric the practice known as Eucharistical adoration has become widely prevalent in the Church of England, only shows how little dependence can be placed on forms of words to keep even excellent and religious people from doing the things they have a mind to do.

In taking leave of the Caroline revision, it may be permitted to dwell for a moment upon the serious character of the conclusion reached by the ecclesiastical leaders of that day. An opportunity was given them to conciliate dissent. Without going all lengths, without in any measure imperilling the great foundation principles of Anglican religion, they might, it would seem, have won back to the national church thousands of those whom their sternness not only repelled but permanently embittered. But it was the hour of victory with the Churchmen, and "Woe to the conquered" seems to have been their cry. They set their faces as a flint against concession; they passed their iron-clad act of uniformity, and now for more than two hundred years religion in Great Britain has been a household divided against itself. Perhaps nothing that the men of the Restoration could have done would have made it otherwise. Perhaps the familiar question of the cynical Dean of St. Patrick's, "What imports it how large a gate you open, if there be always left a number who place a pride and a merit in refusing to enter?" was a fair question, and fatal to any dream of unity. And yet one may be pardoned for believing that had a little of the oil of brotherly kindness been poured upon those troubled waters we whom the waves still buffet might to-day be sailing a smoother sea.

As stated above, the Convocation of 1662 gave to the Prayer-book of the Church of England the form it has ever since retained. But it must not be supposed that no efforts have been made meanwhile to bring changes to pass. The books, written upon the subject form a literature by themselves.

The one really serious attempt to reconstruct the Liturgy in post-Caroline times was that which grew naturally enough out of the Revolution of 1688. In every previous crisis of political change, the Prayer-book had felt the tremor along with the statute-book.

Church and State, like heart and brain, are sympathetically responsive to one another; revisions of rubrics go naturally along with revisions of codes. It was only what might have been anticipated, therefore, that when William and Mary came to the throne a Commission should issue for a new review. If Elizabeth had found it necessary to revise the book, if James had found it necessary, if Charles had found it necessary, why should not the strong hand of William of Orange be laid upon the pages? But this time the rule was destined to find its exception. The work of review was, indeed, undertaken by a Royal Commission, including among its members the great names of Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and Beveridge, but nothing came of their work. Convocation again showed itself unfriendly to anything like concessive measures, and so complete was the obscurity into which the doings of the Commission fell, that even as late as 1849, Cardwell, in the third edition of his *History of Conferences*, speaks as if he knew nothing of the whereabouts of the record. In 1854 the manuscript minutes of the Commission's proceedings were discovered in the library of Lambeth Palace, and by order of Parliament printed as a Blue-book. The same document has also been published in a more readable form by Bagster. One rises from the perusal of this Broad Church Prayer-book—for such, perhaps, Tillotson's attempt may not unfairly be called—profoundly thankful that the promoters of it were not suffered to succeed. The Preface to our American Book of Common Prayer refers to this attempted review of 1689 "as a great and good work." But the greatness and the goodness must have lain in the motive, for one fails to discern them either in the matter or in the manner of what was recommended.

Even Macaulay, Whig that he is, fails not to put on record his condemnation of the literary violence which the Prayer-book so narrowly escaped at the hands of the Royal Commission of 1689. Terseness was not the special excellency of Macaulay's own style, yet even he resented Bishop Patrick's notion that the collects could be improved by amplification. One of the few really good suggestions made by the Commissioners was that of using the Beatitudes in the Office of the Holy Communion as an alternate for the Decalogue. There are certain festivals of the Christian year when such a substitution would be most timely and refreshing.

We make a leap now of just a hundred years. From 1689 we pass to 1789, and find ourselves in the city of Philadelphia, at a convention assembled for the purpose of framing a constitution and setting forth a liturgy for a body of Christians destined to be known as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. During the interval between the issue of the Declaration of Independence and the Ratification of the Constitution of the United States, the people in this country who had been brought up in the communion of the Church of England found themselves ecclesiastically in a very delicate position indeed. As colonists they had been canonically under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, a somewhat remote Diocesan. But with this Episcopal bond broken and no new one formed, they seemed to be in a peculiar sense adrift. It does not fall to me to narrate the steps that led to the final establishment of the episcopacy upon a sure foundation, nor yet to trace the process through which the Church's legislative system came gradually to its completion. Our interest is a liturgical one, and our subject matter the evolution of the Prayer-book. I say nothing, therefore, of other matters that were debated in the Convention of 1789, but shall propose instead that we confine ourselves to what was said and done about the Prayer-book. In order, however, to fully appreciate the situation we must go back a little. In a half-formal and half-informal fashion there had come into existence, four years before this Convention of 1789 assembled, an American Liturgy now known by the name of The Proposed Book. It had been compiled on the basis of the English Prayer-book by a Committee of three eminent clergymen, Dr. White, of Pennsylvania, Dr. William Smith, of Maryland, and Dr. Wharton, of Delaware. Precisely what measure of acceptance this book enjoyed, or to what extent it came actually into use are difficult, perhaps hopeless questions.

What we know for certain is that the public opinion of the greater number of Churchmen rejected it as inadequate and unsatisfactory. In the Convention of 1789 the Proposed Book does not seem to have been seriously considered in open debate at all, though doubtless there was much talk about it, much controversy over its merits and demerits at Philadelphia dinner-tables and elsewhere while the session was in progress.

The truth is, the changes set forth in The Proposed Book were too sweeping to commend themselves to the sober second-thought of men whose blood still showed the tincture of English conservatism. Possibly also some old flames of Tory resentment were rekindled, here and there, by the prominence given in the book to a form of public thanksgiving for the Fourth of July. There were Churchmen doubtless at that day who failed duly to appreciate what were called in the title of the office, "the inestimable blessings of Religious and Civil Liberty." Others again may have been offended by the treatment measured out to the Psalter, which was portioned into thirty selections of two parts each, with the *Benedicite* added at the end, to be used, if desired, on the thirty-first day of any month. Another somewhat crude and unliturgical device was the running together without break of the Morning Prayer and the Litany.

I speak of blemishes, but the Proposed Book had its excellences also. Just at present it is the fashion in Anglican circles to heap ridicule and contempt on The Proposed Book out of all proportion to its real demerits. Somehow it is thought to compromise us with the English by showing up our ecclesiastical ancestors in an unfavorable light as unlearned and ignorant men. It is treated as people will sometimes treat an old family portrait of a forebear, who in his day was under a cloud, mismanaged trust funds, or made money in the slave trade. Thus a grave historiographer by way of speaking comfortably on this score, assures us that the volume "speedily sunk into obscurity," becoming one of the rarest of the books illustrative of our ecclesiastical annals.

And yet, curiously enough, the Proposed Book was in some points more "churchly," using the word in a sense expressive of liturgical accuracy, than the book finally adopted. In the Morning Prayer it has the *Venite* in full and not abridged. The *Benedictus* it also gives entire. A single form of Absolution is supplied. The versicles following upon the Creed are more numerous than ours. In the Evening Prayer the great Gospel Hymns, the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc dimittis*, stand in the places to which we with tardy justice have only just restored them.

Again, if we consider those features of the Proposed Book that were retained and made part of the Liturgy in 1789, we shall have further reason to refrain from wholesale condemnation of this tentative work. For example, we owe the two opening sentences of Morning Prayer, "The Lord is in his holy temple" and "From the rising of the sun," to The Proposed Book, and also the special form for Thanksgiving Day. And yet, on the whole, the Convention of 1789 acted most wisely in determining that it would make the Prayer-book of the Church of England, rather than The Proposed Book, the real basis of revision. It did so, and as a result we have what has served us so well during the first century of our national life—the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. The points wherein the American Prayer-book differs from the Prayer-book of the Church of England are too numerous to be catalogued in full. "They will appear," says the Preface (a composition borrowed, by the way, almost wholly from the Proposed Book), "and, it is to be hoped, the reasons of them also, upon a comparison of this with the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England."

The most important differences are the following: The permissive use of "Selections of Psalms in place of the Psalms appointed for the day of the month." This was doubtless suggested by the wholesale transformation of the Psalter in the Proposed Book into a series of selections.

The permitted shortening of the Litany is an American feature.

A number of the special prayers, as, for example, the prayer for a sick person, that for persons going to sea, the thanksgivings for a recovery and for a safe return, all these are peculiar to the American use. Extensive alterations were made in the Marriage

Service and certain greatly needed ones in the Burial Office. The two most noteworthy differences, however, are the omission from our Prayer-book of the so-called Athanasian Creed, and the insertion in it of that part of the Consecration Prayer in the Communion Office known as the Invocation. The engrafting of this latter feature we owe to the influence of Bishop Seabury, who by this addition not only assimilated the language of our liturgy more closely to that of the ancient formularies of the Oriental Church, but also insured our being kept reminded of the truly spiritual character of Holy Communion. "It is the spirit that quickeneth," this Invocation seems to say, "the flesh profiteth nothing." Quite in line with this was the alteration made at the same time in the language of the Catechism. "The body and blood of Christ," says the English book, "which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

"The Body and Blood of Christ," says the American book, "which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Many verbal changes are to be found scattered here and there through the book, some of them for the better, some, perhaps for the worse. The prevailing purpose seems to have been to expunge all obsolete words and phrases while dealing tenderly with obsolescent ones. In this course, however, the revisers were by no means always and everywhere consistent.

"Prevent," in the sense of "anticipate," is altered in some places but left unchanged in others. In the Visitation of Prisoners, an office borrowed from the Irish Prayer-book, the thoroughly obsolete expression, "As you tender," in the sense of "as you value," the salvation of your soul, is retained.

From the Psalter has disappeared in the American Book "Thou tellest my flittings," although why this particular archaism should have been selected for banishment and a hundred others spared, it is not easy to understand.

Perhaps some sudden impatience seized the reviser, like that which moved Bishop Wren, while annotating his Prayer-book, to write on the margin of the calendar for August, "Out with 'dog days' from among the saints."

Considering what a bond of unity the Lord's Prayer appears to be becoming among all English-speaking worshippers, it is, perhaps, to be regretted that our revisers changed the wording of it in two or three places. The excision of "Lighten our darkness" must probably be attributed to the prosaic matter-of-fact temper which had possession of everybody and everything during the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

The Ordinal, the Articles, the Consecration of Churches, and the Institution of Ministers, made no part of the Prayer-book as it was set forth in 1789, nor do they, even now, strictly speaking, make a part of it, although in the matter of binding force and legal authority they are on the same footing.

The Ordinal and Articles are substantially identical with the English Ordinal and Articles, save in the matter of a reference to the Athanasian Creed and several references to the connection of Church and State. The Consecration of Churches and the Institution of Ministers are offices distinctively American. If I add that the American book drops out of the Visitation of the Sick a form of private absolution, and greatly modifies the service for Ash-Wednesday, we shall have made our survey of differences tolerably, though by no means exhaustively complete.

And now what is the lesson taught us by the history of the Prayer-book? Homiletical as the question sounds, it is worth asking.

We have reviewed rapidly, but not carelessly, the vicissitudes of the book's wonderful career, and we ought to be in a position to draw some sort of instructive inference from it all. Well, one thing taught us is this, the singular power of survival that lives in gracious words. They wondered at the "gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth," and because they wondered at them they treasured them up.

Kind words, says the child's hymn, can never die, neither can kindly words, and kindly in the deepest sense are many, many of the words of the Common Prayer; they touch that which is most catholic in us, that which strongly links us to our kind. There is that in some of the collects which as it has lasted since the days when Roman Emperors were sitting on their thrones, so will it last while man continues what he is, a praying creature.

Another thing taught us by the Prayer-book's history is the duty of being for ever on our guard in the religious life against "the falsehood of extremes."

The emancipated thinkers who account all standards of belief to be no better than dungeon walls, scoff at this feature of the Anglican character with much bitterness. "Your Church is a Church of compromises," they say, "and your boasted *Via media* only a coward's path, the poor refuge of the man who dares not walk in the open." But when we see this Prayer-book condemned for being what it is by Bloody Mary, and then again condemned for being what it is by the Long Parliament, the thought occurs to us that possibly there is enshrined in this much-persecuted volume a truth larger than the Romanist is willing to tolerate, or the Puritan generous enough to apprehend.

A third important lesson is that we are not to confound revision with ruin, or to suppose that because a book is marvellously good it cannot conceivably be bettered. Each accomplished revision of the Book of Common Prayer has been a distinct step in advance. If God in his wise Providence suffered an excellent growth of devotion to spring up out of the soil of England in the days of Edward the Sixth; and, after many years, determined that like a vine out of Egypt it should be brought across the sea and given root on these shores, we need not fear that we are about to lose utterly our pleasant plant if we notice that the twigs and leaves are adapting themselves to the climate and the atmosphere of the new dwelling-place. The life within the vine remains what it always was. The growth means health. The power of adaptation is the guarantee of a perpetual youth.

CATHOLICISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

BY RICHARD ROTHE.

(Condensed translation by *Rev. Charles C. Starbuck*, Andover, Mass., from the *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*, pub. at Freiburg, by Drs. Hase, Lipsius, Pfleiderer, Schrader. XV. Jahrgang, 3. Heft. June, 1889. PRELIMINARY NOTE by Dr. Karo, Archdeacon at Chemnitz.)

[THE following is the exact reproduction of the introductions to the two leading divisions of Rothe's prelection upon Symbolics, essentially according to a carefully prepared report of the year 1860. Everything appertaining to literary history has been omitted, and this only, especially the remarks respecting the origin and formulation of the œcumenical symbols, as we were only concerned to communicate Rothe's peculiar apprehension of the topic. This has led us to content ourselves with simply adjoining the final result of the symbolic process. We had the less scruple to give up the present delineation of the individual dogmas, as Rothe's views upon them are known from his prelections on Dogmatics (published by Schenkel), and partly also from his essay, *Zur Dogmatik*. Our communication seems to deserve particular interest in the present historical juncture.]

I.

GENETIC CONCEPTION OF CATHOLICISM.

The Catholic conception of doctrine, especially in its completely developed form as Roman Catholic, is not the purely and genuinely Christian. But it is very far indeed from being an accidental growth, a late intruder. It is not an arbitrary manufacture, but a plant of altogether natural growth, the consistent product of the point of view on which the most ancient Christendom has from the very beginning apprehended Christianity, the apprehension of Christianity as CHURCH. When Christianity, on principle, was brought into the form of the Church, it could not fail to assume precisely this shape. Hence the tenacity with which the Catholic Church has maintained itself. Protestantism, while it rightly sees in Catholicism a degeneration of Christianity, must at the same time recognize the ecclesiastical form as one that contradicts the essence of Christianity. Of this Catholicism is itself the actual proof. That Christianity was from the very beginning viewed and developed as Church was something necessary, essentially involved in the course which the development of mankind through Christianity *must* take, an unavoidable historical necessity.

What form of Christianity must consistently result for us from the assumption that Christianity has to secure its position in the world as *Church*; that the community, by means of which it has to seek the realization of its idea, is a Church? What means this: Christianity is in its essence Church? It means: Christianity, according to its essence, finds its actualization in a community, which, *immediately*, is *exclusively religious*, communion of *piety*, not in a religiously *ethical* community, but in one *merely* religious, not in one in which piety has its existence in morality *as such*, as animating it and receiving its contents from it, but a community in which the object in question is *Piety and nothing else*, and this, moreover, purely *as immediate*, absolutely for itself alone, in complete abstraction from anything else, in which it might exist, and therefore from the ethical as such.

Here it is not the current conception of the Church which lies at the foundation. We are accustomed to regard Church and Christianity as identical. There is confusion of view as to the relation of the Ethical and the Religious. To the question concerning the nature of the Church we almost invariably receive the answer : The Church is the Religious Community. But this definition is too broad. It rests on the assumption that there is no other religious community than the Church. But is she the only community of religious nature ? The Family is no less so ; a family without piety is to the Christian inconceivable. Nor will the Christian dispute that this applies also to the remaining social spheres. A flourishing art life is not possible without religious apprehensions and spirit. Even so is it in scientific life : the idea of God is the true illuminating light in Science. The same is also to be said of social and of public life. It must, therefore, be said of the great sphere which combines them all to organic unity, of the STATE. That the Church is a religious community does not distinguish her from the other human circles of society ; they are *human*, and Man is, what he is, as the image of his Maker. The others are likewise all devout, religious associations, but not as though this were the *only thing* in them, nor indeed that which is *immediately* expressed by them, but they have yet another object of the association, and this primarily a *natural* object. The family rests upon Sex ; Art and Science upon the World as object of individual or universal Cognition ; social and public life upon the World as object of individual and public Transformation ; the State upon the World as object of the ethical functions in their totality. To this natural object, *immediately*, the association refers itself, and therefore to something ethical, in such a way that it makes it the organ of religious feeling. But with the *Church*, in distinction from these spheres, things are altogether different ; she has to do *alone* with religious feeling *as such*, the other forms of association with religious feeling according to its interior essential relations to morality. The Church is *purely* religious association. Even assuming that the development of mankind had been normal, this purely Religious Community is an absolutely indispensable *element* therein, it is the basis for the pure development of all other forms of association ; it is the *universal* community. But when it is said : The Church is the *essential* form of Christianity, or : if Christianity has to realize itself as a community, this is the Church, this signifies : The community, in which Christianity has to develop itself, is a simply religious one. This has for Christianity itself momentous and ominous consequences. If Christianity is to find its realization essentially in such a community, this can only be grounded upon a corresponding feature of its own essence, in this, that Christianity is *only* religious feeling, simply *immediate* devoutness or Religion, a religion to which it is essential to be, purely and isolatedly, Piety, a religion which is independent of everything else which is not immediate Devotion, which is therefore a piety whose contents and conditions are not ethical. This involves the assumption that in Christianity no teleological reference of morality to piety finds place, no reciprocal conditioning of the one by the other. This view is only then possible, when the Ethical as such and in the significance which in itself appertains to it has as yet not even come into the consciousness, when it is, indeed, in a measure acknowledged *materialiter*, but is, as yet, *formaliter*, not at all discovered and understood. Piety (Frömmigkeit) ensues when Man is referred to God, as conditioned by this reference. It is that definite form of human existence, which it has through its relation to God. Quite independently of this stands Man in relation to himself and to the world surrounding him. By virtue of this conception an altogether definite mission is placed before him. Here is an entirely new sphere, the ethical. Man, as a personal being, is appointed to an activity directed upon himself and upon the world surrounding him. This appointed work stands interiorly in the most indissoluble relation to the religious function. Only by accomplishing the ethical can he accomplish the religious. These requirements of the ethical destiny are, therefore, first adopted by Religion, and brought to men as requirements of God. So in the Old and yet more in the New Testament. Moses brings the Decalogue not as the summary of the ethical commandments, but as written with the finger of God, as the expression of the Divine will. This is, therefore, *materialiter* ethical commandment, but in the form of the religious commandment, the thought of the *ethical* commandment not being present. It is a great distinction, whether the thought of the ethical itself has already come into man's horizon, or whether he as yet knows no other thought than that of Religion. For then his acts and omissions will only refer themselves to the ethical commandments in that proportion in which they are *religious* requirements. The rest will be to him " World," if not altogether a thing repugnant to piety. Whether in *my own nature* anything lies that requires these commandments is there not at all reflected upon.

The temptation is always strong, to esteem Piety *only as such,* when it appears in the uniform of piety, is served up on a salver. The deepest piety is precisely that which does not make its appearance for itself alone.

It is not doubtful, that that conception of Christianity is one that stands in the most cutting contradiction to the innermost being of Christianity. The essence of Christianity is to be, not *mere* Religion, but Piety and Morality in consummate interpenetration ; it demands absolutely religious morality and ethical piety. So long as Christianity is Religion, its essence consists in this, that it is absolutely *ethical* Religion. The essence of Protestantism is, that it is religiously *ethical* Christianity, therefore not the *ecclesiastical,* but the *civil, secular,* Christianity. Of this Catholicism knows nothing, its essence is to be merely Catholic *religion.* But here we have as yet held entirely aloof from the question, how the apprehension of Christianity as Church stands related to Christianity. Here is to be inquired, what form of Christianity would necessarily result, if one would conceive it as *essentially Church,* therefore as essentially *mere—i.e.,* not ethically mediated Religion ? The inevitable next consequence which, in its principle, includes all the rest in it, would be a one-sided, exclusive, absolute Supernaturalism. Christianity undoubtedly is, in its innermost nature, Supernaturalism, but it is not *mere* Supernaturalism. It is, unquestionably, an essentially Divine, and therefore supernatural life, but not a *merely* Divine, but a theanthropic life ; it goes back to God as its causality, but to his efficient activity in man as one which, on the side of man, is ethically conditioned and mediated. If now Christianity as ecclesiastical is to be mere, not ethically mediated, religion, the human function, which is interpenetrated with the Divine—*i.e.,* the ethical function, must be abstracted in thought. That Supernaturalism which is essentially specific to Christianity is here turned to *pure* Supernaturalism. This is, then, at the same time a *one-sided* Supernaturalism, while Christianity is at the same time both supernatural and ethical. From this point of view the essentially ethical function of man, and thereby the properly Human, vanishes altogether. This pure Supernaturalism appears in two different forms, which, however, can only have been given together : in *doctrine* it becomes Supra—or, it may be, Anti-rationalism ; in *practice,* Magic, more exactly Theurgy (magic, which goes back to Divine causality). If one-sided Supernaturalism is the character of Christianity, Christianity and Church must be ideally represented as having originated, and as now operating in a purely supernatural manner. Christianity as objective, the Christian institute of salvation, must then, by an immediate Divine positing, be already all that it has to be and immediately is. It is permitted to have no human development, it can and may not become anything through human mediation, which it is not already through Divine positing. It is permitted to have no history, for History is something natural. It must already have been given complete with the revelation of God in Christ, there can be no sort of talk of progressive transformation of the form of its manifestation according to the standard afforded by periods and nations and the steady mutation of manners and of the stage of culture, but all which helps to constitute the objective manifestation of Christianity must have been given complete at the same time with its entrance into the world ; as it was in its birth-hour, it must remain immutably for all times. The one responsibility is to maintain Christianity as it originally was, by faithful Tradition. Every historical development would be something contributed by the Natural, Human, and would therefore prejudice its pure supernaturalness. The Christian Doctrine, especially, must have been given complete with the entry of the Revelation, and is not to be further developed by means of human science, else it would be also in part a product of the human cognitive activity. Now, Christianity is here presupposed to be essentially Church—all these deductions therefore apply to the Church *in concreto.* The Church must be conceived as immediately complete on all sides, and as to all elements of being, therefore as being likewise not exposed to human accidents and alterations. The Church, moreover, is neither capable nor in need of being bettered or perfected, she is also lifted out of the range of all corrupting natural accidents, therefore *incorruptible* and *infallible.* It is involved in her idea, that a guarantee must have been expressly provided for maintaining the original tradition unsullied.

As the Church must thus be conceived as having originated in a purely supernatural way, she must also herself be conceived as a purely supernatural institute. There must, therefore, also appertain to her a purely supernatural authority and plenipotence, without the interposition of a human mediation ; by virtue of a purely supernatural—*i.e.,* magical relation to Christ, she must stand forth as Representative of Christ, her existence must be to us *immediately Christ's presence,* and that His *effective presence.* So also her life and working is to be conceived as the life and working of Christ in her and through her, therefore not merely in her and through her giving effect to the Divine energies of Redemption, and her essence as consisting in this, that she suffers these to work out from her upon the world—this would be a thoroughly just conception—but these energies of Christ are further to be apprehended as living in her and working through her upon the world in *a purely supernatural manner,* in a way which, on the human side—that is, ethically, is unmediated, magical. The specific living functions of the Church must be conceived as consisting in the uninterrupted magical reception of these redeeming energies and in the uninterrupted magical communication of the same to the world. These energies must, therefore, be also *exclusively bound to the Church,* because as purely supernatural they are conceived as communicating themselves in a purely supernatural way, and cannot be conceived as given in any other institution than a purely supernatural one —*nulla salus extra ecclesiam.* To this end the Church requires an Organ, whereby she receives these supernatural energies in a purely supernatural, therefore magical way, from Christ, and communicates them to the world, and moreover she must possess it from the very beginning of her being *through immediate institution of Christ.* Christ has given the APOSTLES plenipotentiary authority to represent Him and to act in his Name, and equipped them with supernatural gifts. The APOSTOLATE is therefore the ordained organ of the Church for her Magic. But the life of the Apostles was only transitory. Yet with their departure the Church cannot have lost her instrument of working. The Apostolate cannot therefore have disappeared. It cannot, therefore, be conceived as inseparably attached to the persons of the Apostles, but as immortally renewing itself in the Church, as a Church Office. The Ecclesiastical Ministry must be conceived as an Apostolic Ministry, the Episcopate as a Continuation of the Apostolate, as a perennial renewal of the Apostolate, and, moreover, as propagating itself in a purely supernatural manner, therefore by magic transmission in the Church from predecessor to successor. This peculiar organ of the life of the Church is it also *in concreto,* wherein the immediate representation of Christ Himself is given in fact, it appears as the real Representative of Christ himself, *it acts as Christ's Vicar,* and that purely by virtue of its supernatural endowment, quite irrespectively of the ethical quality of the persons, as to whether these are such that an operation of Christ can have been ethically mediated in them. The original Apostolate was administered by a plurality of persons; the like must also be the case with the Episcopate. If this Plurality is to be the vicarious operation of Christ, it must set itself forth for visible unity in a Primate as Organ of the unity. Even the Apostolic Collgege had this in the person of Peter. So the Episcopate requires its Primacy. The latter, as the concentrated unity of the Episcopate, is then self-evidently *sensu eminenti* to be viewed as *vicarius Christi.* This Episcopate appears therefore as being, by exclusive vocation, Keeper and Interpreter of Tradition.

This fundamental view must also be the standard for the view of the specifically Christian form of human *Life.* That Life, which is required by Christianity, can, from this position, not be conceived as an actually *theanthropic* life, such a Divine life as is *interior* to man, not such a one as, without prejudice to its Supernaturalness and Divinity, is yet lived *in the man himself,* and *from him as personal centre,* but as one to which the man stands related as to something foreign to him. An inner renewal or divinization or sanctification of Man and of human society through Christ, from this point of view, does not at all take place. Christianity must thus, with its requirements, again become Law, and that not only on the practical, but also on the theoretical side. For even Faith remains something external to man, not mediated nor to be mediated, something to which he blindly grants his recognition as Authority (*nova lex*). More precisely it then becomes ecclesiastical *enactment,* and that as Divinely authorized. What appears now as the appointed activity of the Christian? The Christian life is essentially *ecclesiastical,* and only ecclesiastical life is really Christian, there is no Christian activity except as ecclesiastical. The individual can be accounted as of the actual, active Christians only in the measure in which he expressly lives in the service of the Church as her organ, as he is an *ecclesiastical officer.* In the proper sense, therefore, only the Clergy are Christians, the laity are only improperly Christians. The Christian Church can only consist of the actual Christians, and this involves the consequence, that the corporation of the Clergy alone is the veritable Church. The laity, it is true, are *in* the Church, but they are *not themselves the Church,* they are in the Church as the mere Object of her operation, not at the same time as Subject of it. Therefore they can have in the Church no active, but simply a passive citizenship, and they are in thorough dependence, at every point, on the Clergy. The latter, over against them, is a Hierarchy. What purpose now must the Christian—*i.e.*, ecclesiastical activity, propose to itself ? how will it desire to shape human life ? It can set out for nothing else than to make human life into an *ecclesiastical* life—*i.e.*, into a purely religious life, a Cultus. The *whole* of Christian practice must thereby be apprehended as ecclesiastical, as purely religious, as appertaining to a cultus. The whole of human life is to be fashioned into a Mere Cultus, it must be used up *within the Church,* for only within the Church can it be Christian. After what type ? As to this the decision is given by pure Supernaturalism. This assigns to Christianity a thoroughly negative attitude toward the natural human life. According to this the Christian cannot project for himself a world in analogy with the scheme of the natural human life, not in analogy with concrete reality, but only in direct opposition to this. The proper Christian world must, as it were, be a real world turned topsy turvy, not a reproduction of the actual in a glorified form, but a *fantastic* world (Romanticism of the Middle Ages). The attitude of this life to the naturally human —*i.e.*, ethical life must be a purely negative one. Regarded from this point of view the Christian life and the Christian community are *only* Church, and all that is *not* Church is in itself profane ; a realm of Redemption, a Kingdom of God and Christ is only to be found so far as the Church extends. The whole *ethical* sphere is " World " and *profane.* Thus the mission of Christianity does not present itself as this, to renew and perfect the natural ethical life, which appears absolutely unreceptive of this (Pessimism), but to *remove* it, to *annihilate* it. The practical requirement, therefore, results to the Christian, to *renounce the world*—that is, the ethical life, abolish it in his own person, to withdraw himself from it. From all who will be *veritable* Christians, this renunciation must therefore be inexorably required. Especially must this be enjoined on all, who are destined to be express organs of the Church, and therefore on all clergymen (Celibacy). Only the Clergy and the Monks constitute the Church Proper as the perfect Christians, all the rest belong only passively to the Church. What thus appears as Christian perfection, is not universally practicable. The Church cannot ethically hallow the natural human life, nor yet again annihilate it. In doing so she would at the same time annihilate herself, for it is her substratum. Natural sensuousness is, therefore, to be respected as something invincible. But the Church is in possession of a magical, supernatural power, by virtue of which she can render it her bondservant. Thus her mission shapes itself thus, that, without its undergoing an essential change of quality, it shall be brought absolutely under the power of the Church and therewith of Christianity, to paralyze its existence as separate from the Church, and in compensation *to transplant it into the Church,* and thereby to render it dependent on her, to condition it by her. It must be *brought into the form of Cultus,* and hereby be *sanctified* in a purely supernatural—*i.e.*, magical way. It must be overlaid with a network of Sacraments, all human acts and omissions be bound to the Church and thereby to the Cultus and Temple. Church, Cultus, and Temple must be everywhere carried out into secular life. This can only come to pass in a *merely external manner,* by transference of forms of a cult to the natural ethical relations of life—*i.e.*, *only symbolically.* Nevertheless, let it be done efficaciously. For as the operations of Christ are mentally presented as purely supernatural, *there is no need of an ethical mediation*, and the Church is in the immediate possession of the supernatural sanctifying energies of Christ, and of the power to set them in operation. Those symbolical acts effect without ethical mediation what they symbolize, *ex opere operato.* The Church will thus through the Sacraments magically hallow the natural ethical life, without ability or purpose to alter anything in its actual character, will by her sacramental acts apply forgiving and sanctifying Grace to the profane World and thus hallow this *realiter.* Naturally, *it is only the Clergy that can accomplish this action of the Church,* only the *active* Church, and this, indeed, is the vocation of the Clergy, levitically to hallow the profane lay-people by their consecrating acts, by impressing upon them, theurgically, the ecclesiastical signature. The laity, therefore, need not themselves to be co-operative thereby, they are merely *passive,* if only they do not expressly withstand the ecclesiastical action upon them (*obicem opponere*). Thus the Church through her clerical Priesthood will be continually expiating, theurgically, the sin of the world, which she has the consciousness of not being able to come at in fact. *Her specific life is lived by the Clergy, but for the Laity as well.* Everything ecclesiastical is done by the Clergy for the laity likewise. All the latter's concern is trustfully to let it take place, or at most passively to look on. Thus the Clergy appears as Mediator between Christ and the intrinsically secular laity, these can only through those become partakers of redemption, and are therefore *absolutely dependent upon them.* The Clergy becomes a Priesthood, without whose intervention there is for the laity no Christ at all.

Notwithstanding these consecrating acts, the natural life persists in its estrangement from God, but the Church must peremptorily require of her adherents, to look away, on principle, from this fact, and assume that which has been hallowed by her in a merely external manner as being actually holy. Therefore, from this point of view, the tendency to a *naïvely fantastic idealizing of the natural human life* cannot fail to ensue. Therewith, however, there comes into this form of Christian piety, as its principle, an Untruth, a deeply poisonous lie. If thus the natural life, with all its sinfulness, is apprehended as not to be altered, and it is supposed that the sinfulness is covered up in God's eyes by that external signature of the Church, ecclesiastical Christianity must evidently form an exceedingly moderate conception of the sinfulness and corruption of the natural human life, and hold the natural condition of man for a decidedly tolerable one, for otherwise it could not content itself with the view of the real unhealableness of its malady. So far as it deduces the present sinful corruption from a Fall, it must believe that in this no more was lost than what the Church by purely supernatural infusion magically recommunicates to man. Ecclesiastically apprehended Christianity must decidedly incline in *a Pelagianizing direction.* It is strengthened in this by the fact, that by virtue of its one-sided Supernaturalism, according to which becoming and being a Christian is to it no ethical interior process, it can require of man a merely outer, passive attitude, his natural capacity for which is undeniable. The relative Ethical Indifference, which is inseparable from pure Supernaturalism, as cause and effect, is of itself Pelagian. And so also one-sided Supernaturalism must have a leaning to Rationalism, which is the same on the theoretical side as Pelagianism on the practical. As much as is conceded to human life thelematically must also be conceded theoretically.

Moreover, concerning the *relation of the Church to the State,* there results from this: when the natural human life is conceived as profane and unchristian, that can only attain the dignity and estimation of a Christian life through ecclesiastical Magic, the Church cannot concede to it—*i.e.,* to the State, any rights or claims whatever over against herself, but must demand that it should unconditionally subordinate itself to her as the purely Divine ordinance. The Church must require of all the states of the earth such a subjection, and stake everything on compelling it. Only in this unconditional dependence are the states hallowed. If the Church would carry through this pretension, she must have a vigorous Organ, in order to conduct her spiritual power effectively to the goal. Here also there necessarily results the PAPACY.

The necessity of all these consequences cannot be overlooked, nor also, that *this* Christianity is a caricature of *real* Christianity. *But these are the characteristic features of Catholicism.* Yet it is not the *original* Catholicism. This contained only its living germs. The involved consequences actuated themselves only very slowly, amid many fluctuations. For what was apprehended in this form of Ecclesiasticism was really *genuine Christianity itself.* But this is in its essence neither more nor less than the absolutely ethical religion, and *materialiter* it manifested itself as this from the very beginning, only not *formaliter.* From its very beginning it addressed to believers the ethical requirement, but *not under the form of ethical,* but *exclusively in the form of religious requirement,* therefore not in the form of requirements which are grounded in man's own being, but grounded in the will of God. The concrete contents, which were included in the idea of the Church, offered therefore an express resistance to the conclusions to which that idea of the Church urged Christians. This resistance could not fail of partial success, especially as to the ancient Church the conception of the Church was not distinct, but only instinctive, although it thereby only worked the more surely. Through the ancient, especially most ancient Church, go two currents, which are opposed to each other and limit each other, the one proceeding from the idea of the Church, the other from Christianity itself, from the actual spirit of Christianity, therefore from the spirit which was actually effective through Christ in believers and the Church. But the former current more and more gains the upper hand. The actually existent Christianity, through a form repugnant to it, came more and more into straits, and must therefore be more and more deteriorated.

This, it is true, could only go on for a time, or the ancient Church would not have been the bearer of Christianity. In so far, undoubtedly, it is a self-delusion of the Roman Church, when she supposes that she alone finds herself in identity with the ancient Church. But apart from this, she is entirely in the right, when she regards herself as the continuation of the ancient *Church,* and claims this character for herself alone. Yet that element constitutes always a significant distinction between the ancient and the present Roman Catholic Church. Down to the Reformation ancient Catholicism followed without embarrassment its inner impulse. A really clear protest, which should have attested to it the essential contradiction between its character and the spirit of original Christianity, had down to that time not encountered it. The *present* Roman Catholicism, the *Tridentine,* maintains the previous character of Catholicism, even since the historical development of Christianity has brought that contradicion to light—that is, against the explicit testimony of history, with tenacious refractoriness; it has sanctioned it and fixed it once for all by a Counter-reformation, by which it has forever cut off from itself the return to the original Christianity. From the time of the Reformation, therefore, the false Christianity of Catholicism became a veritable Anti-christianity, the Untruth became a Lie.

That Christianity from the very beginning was apprehended under the ecclesiastical form is a fact. But this was also *historically necessary.* After the Redeemer had entered into the history of the world and gathered for himself a little company of believers, the following questions could not fail at once to present themselves: What position has the believer on Jesus as the Christ as such to take in the world? He has to place his life at the disposal of the purposes of his Lord. What mission, from this point of view, has he to propose to himself in the world? Furthermore: The Christians are conjoined with each other through a drawing of love grounded in their common faith, and thereby immediately constrained to associate in a Community. A co-operation of Christians for the purpose appointed them in common by the Lord is utterly impossible without such an association, and, moreover, an *actual--i.e.,* an *ordered* and *organized* community. But now what form is this to assume, that it may correspond to its purpose and its own nature? After what plan shall the Christian community and its life be ordered? These questions did not at the first present themselves to believers. For one thing, they found themselves already in a community of which they never even doubted that it was essentially that appointed by God for believers, in the Old Testament theocracy. Furthermore, they did not yet experience a lively need of a fixed Christian commonwealth, because they had no conception of an historical continuance of Christianity and an historical development of mankind by means of Christianity, but only awaited the immediately impending consummation of all human history through the speedy return of the Lord. The Lord Himself, in great wisdom, had not declared Himself as to these questions. Only so much had He intimated as to be self-evidently assumed, that His believers would constitute a community, an Assembly of the People, an *ἐκκλησία* (as קָהָל). Touching the form of this association He has never left fall a hint. This indefiniteness could not endure. The first occasion to weigh this question arose for Paul. He had attained to a clear insight into the specific newness of the Gospel in antithesis to the legal order of the Old Covenant. Thereby, for him, Christianity detached itself from the Old Testament theocracy. He assigned to it a distinctive position. But this involved the question, where these Christians should abide in the world. He answered it by establishing the idea of the *ἐκκλησία* in the Christianly technical sense of the word, by establishing the idea of the Christian community as a *purely religious* one on the basis of the unity of all Christians in faith and in love, and of the manifold charisms distributed among them. Another answer, indeed, was wholly impossible to be found. A *religiously ethical— i.e., civil* community could not come into mind. For Christianity was first known only *as Religion,* and knew as yet nothing of the dignity of the Ethical as such, and therefore as yet nothing of the religiously ethical community, the State, and of the relation of Christianity to it, as indeed the State of that time was incapable of acting as the bearer of Christianity. And the Christians could not build up their community within the State, as the latter at that time expelled them. But notwithstanding that Paul had definitely grasped the *idea* of a Church, the *carrying out* of it does not appear to him urgent, inasmuch as he, too, looked forward to the impending Parusia. The case changed with the year 70. From thenceforth men learned to distinguish in the prophecies of the Redeemer a double Parusia, and postponed the hope of it. With the fall of Jerusalem Christians found the foundation of the Old Testament community to have given way under their feet. They must at all events make provision for the immediate future. So the Pauline idea of the Church was taken up and rendered practical. Indeed, there was no choice in view of the above-mentioned grounds, strengthened as they were by the hostility implied in the very principle of the pagan State. Until then nothing at all like a Religious System had been evolved out of Christianity; it was originally faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and thereby the Redeemer from sin and death, but not at all a summary of doctrinal statements concerning religion. Apart from Paul, Christianity had not yet been an object of scientific reflection. But in proportion as the faith in Christ spread abroad, especially among the scientifically cultivated, scientific thought could not but occupy itself with it. There must be an endeavor to construct a view of the world from this faith as a centre. The endeavors had very different issues. In great part they were endeavors to construe Christianity into heterogeneous views of the world (Gnosticism). Thus a profound falsification of the Christian teaching and thereby a corruption of Christianity itself was to be feared. Against this a remedy must be sought in all haste. This could only consist in an organic connection, which should conjoin Christians and place them under a unitary lead. Thus effective surveillance of doctrine became possible. The means was the knitting together of the individual Christian congregations into the organic whole of a purely religious commonwealth, into *one* Church, the erection of the *Catholic Church*, the universal church. The founding of a universal Church could not be carried into effect otherwise than by the institution of a Church office, an office for governing The Church, an office in itself *unitary*, but administered *in solidum* by a *plurality of incumbents*, and so extending over Christendom. This was the (proper) EPISCOPATE, and *only with its establishment had the Church been founded.* According to this original idea the Episcopate is an institution that rests upon a thoroughly clear and living idea of THE CHURCH. Thus the Catholic Church, although a corruption of Christianity, is in its origin and first development a phenomenon worthy of all admiration.

It was involved in these origins that her activity was of necessity directed to *the conservation of Apostolic Christianity,* and this by the careful Documentation, Definition, Sanction, and Surveillance of the original apostolic TRADITION. Above all, this case must direct itself upon the Christian *Doctrine.* For this, by the conditions of the age, was most immediately endangered, and for the maintenance of Christianity in its purity the most important. It was the only field wherein the position of Christianity at that time allowed free movement. The oldest product of its labor has come to us in the APOSTLES' CREED. In this there lies as yet before us the pure transmission of the original Christian Common faith, and that in its original form, which has as yet passed through no dogmatic elaboration, in purely historical form. The symbol originated out of the primitive formulas for the confession of faith, which was exacted of catechumens; it is the primitive Christian interpretation of the baptismal formula, and therefore the expression of the common faith of the Church since the days of the Apostles. In its gradual evolution a purpose of antithesis to Heresy has had a part, but only as subordinate, and not in every statement. As a fully undogmatic, purely historical confession of the Christian faith, and as the only one common to all Christian churches, it is a jewel of imperishable worth, and we need not fear that it will ever become antiquated.

In reference to the fixation of church Doctrine the activity of the Catholic Church goes on yet for a good while. But the manner of proceeding had to modify itself. At the beginning the only concern was to guard what was Apostolic and hold aloof everything heterogeneous. This alone was in view in defining the *symbolum apostolicum.* But the Church could not stop here. Soon divergent apprehensions of this in detail arose in her own bosom. The quieting of these *inner doctrinal differences* was urgently requisite if the Church was to endure. This could no longer be compassed in the way of a mere recurrence to tradition, but only with the help of a *scientific* process—that is, of a *theological* process. There arose the need of a THEOLOGY. As its mission this presented itself—namely, to develop the church teaching into intellectually distinct *doctrinal propositions,* and thus to qualify it for being authoritatively fixed as DOGMA, the mission, therefore, to *dogmatize,* to translate the facts of the Divine revelation of salvation, transmitted as the object of faith, into intellectually distinct doctrinal propositions. What character this activity will assume may be apprehended from the nature of the position which the Church assumed. This was the churchly, the exclusively religious, therefore one-sidedly supernatural. From this position the Church cannot be minded to accomplish her task with the means of that Science which is otherwise universally accepted in her historical circle ; *not with the means of secular Science,* especially Philosophy, but only with means wholly apart, purely religious, *which stand exclusively at the disposal of the Church—i.e.,* only with the help, on the one hand, of *Tradition,* on the other, of *Inspiration.* This will therefore necessarily constitute itself as a science apart, as Spiritual Science. As it, therefore, in its *principle,* is a purely supernatural one, its *tendency* must also be the purely supernatural —*i.e.,* the *suprarational.* Inasmuch as it brings the contents of the saving revelation into *the outer form of thought,* it will have no interest to demonstrate the *thinkableness* and inner evidence, the *rationality* of these statements ; by virtue of its one-sided supernaturalism its assumption must rather be, that its statements must declare something *unthinkable—i.e.,* not *relatively unthinkable* thoughts, which on a lower level cannot be consummated, but something *absolutely unthinkable,* logically self-contradictory. In the logical unthinkableness of the statements it will find its satisfaction. As the specific character of the ecclesiastical system of doctrine we recognize, therefore, an explicit *Supra-* and *Anti-Rationalism.* That this character is in conflict with the specific nature of Christianity is luminously evident *for us.* There was also requisite an Organ through which the Church formed and uttered the decisions which she by means of her Theology could form, and this under her own authority. This function could only be accomplished by the Church Office, which represented and in fact alone constituted the Church—namely, by the EPISCOPATE. This, according to its idea, was administered *in solidum* by the totality of all the individual incumbents ; accordingly this function could be discharged only *by the assembled College of Bishops.* This was the Institute of the Church Assemblies, Synods, Councils of the Bishops. If this would intervene with the unconditional authority of the Church, it must represent the Church in her totality, the collective Episcopate—ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL.

The object which in the Catholic Church must primarily draw thinking minds to itself was Christ Himself. In the essays to secure an intellectually distinct apprehension of Him, the results of those who occupied themselves therewith could not fail to diverge widely, especially before a definite, universally practicable path had been broken. In Christ Himself it was primarily His Godhead, upon which thought directed itself, the absolutely supernatural in Him, the relation to the Father. This investigation, agreeably to its one-sided Supernaturalism, was not directed, by investigation of the idea of God, to the discovery of an element by virtue of which a real participation of Christ in the Godhead could be conceived, but endeavored to establish, in an entirely unmediated manner, the assertion of the real Godhead of Christ in its opposition to that of Monotheism. The tendency had not the least reference to the solution of the problem, but rather to the requirement that an opposition designated as insoluble should be acknowledged as truth. Exactly in such a formulation of the relation of Christ as the Son of God to his Father, in which the equal and full Godhead should be conceived together with the personal difference of both, could the one sided Supernaturalism of the endeavor find its gratification. A formula of such a kind was the result at which the youthful Catholic theology arrived, as that which in 325, at Nicæa, was solemnly sanctioned by the first properly so-called Symbol propounded by the Church herself, the NICENE. This follows the general course of the Apostles' Creed without receiving into itself every particular detail of this, and maintains the full equality of essence of the Son with the Father, while rejecting every conception of the Son as created. This formula evoked long and vehement controversies, during which the Church came to the consciousness of the difficulties in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. The decision of the Church could only issue in definite parallelism with the doctrine of the Son. At the Second Œcumenical Council, 381, the Constantinopolitan or NICÆNO-CONSTANTINOPOLITAN Symbol was defined, being only a repetition and further elaboration of the Nicene. With the Nicænum and Nicæno-Constantinopolitanum the Symbolum Quicunque or ATHANASIANUM was long conjoined. It was ascribed to Athanasius, yet now the most competent judges of both confessions are agreed that this assumption is wholly unwarranted ; the most transfer it with reason into the fifth century. The Reformers placed it very high, and the Protestants accepted it as a symbol of full authority. Yet it has no manner of claim ; it entirely lacks the formal adoption of the Church. In its contents it contrasts unfavorably with the other two by exclusiveness and intolerance toward every divergence of teaching.

After the interest for the sure establishment of Christ's Godhead had been satisfied, men turned to the other side, the relation between the Godhead and the Manhood in Him, the unity of both. In the treatment of this point also the tendency was determined by one-sided Supernaturalism. Men set themselves against every thought of a mediation—*i.e.*, an *ethical* mediation of both in Christ. The interest of bringing to consciousness the *thinkableness* of a *real* unity of both in Christ, the ancient Church did not know. Men were far from setting out from the idea of Man and seeking in this a point of attachment for a *real* interfusion and mutual unity. This theology merely insisted upon the pure *assertion* of a unity of both immediately posited by an act of absolute Divine power. In this sense there constitutes itself the Dogma of the Person of Christ as the God-man. The Council of Ephesus, 431, introduced the developments, though without propounding an actual Symbol. It was brought to consummation by the Synod of Chalcedon, 451. These doctrinal definitions were completed by the Council held at Constantinople in 680 by occasion of the Monothelite controversies. It confirmed the doctrinal definitions of the earlier œcumenical synods, and opposed to the new error a new ὅρος as a declaration of the Chalcedonian Symbol in regard to the perfection of the human nature of Christ. In Christ there are, it affirms, as two Natures, so also two Wills and Energies, but which do not conflict with each other, but co-operate for the work of redemption, inasmuch as the human will subordinates itself to the Divine. Thereby this doctrine in the ancient Church was perfected.

In the West the interest turned toward the question as to the inner nature of the Redemption brought through Christ, especially the question as to the relation of the operativeness of the supernatural grace of Christ to Man's own activity in the work of the Appropriation of Redemption. This question was handled from the inmost spirit of Christianity, and by that church teacher who was permeated more thoroughly than any one else in his age with the spirit of Christianity, and endowed with singular energy of understanding and will, by Augustine. He handled this question in the spirit *of Christianity, not of the Church,* and he gave for a while to Theology a corresponding direction, but not permanently. In his own work the ecclesiastical tendency crossed him, and this did not suffer a conclusive decision in the sense of Augustine to come into effect, nor indeed any such general and earnest interest in the question, as would have been requisite to an official ecclesiastical decision. The Occidental Church expressed itself in this sense through various Fathers and particular synods, but without lasting effect, as the church tendency urged was strong toward the opposite site. The whole *practice* of the Church assumed more and more a *Pelagianizing direction*, despite the condemnation of Pelagius.

These anthropologico-soteriological questions were at that time indifferent to the Church *as a whole.* Her interest had, especially in the Occident, which alone comes into account, an entirely different bent. As early as the fourth century a new problem had arisen for the Church, which gradually postponed the properly theological interest to a practical one. During the first three centuries *the position of the Church in the world* had been a very simple one. The State as heathen repelled her as She the State. She had over against it to maintain the defensive. This agreed with the idea of the Church, according to which she had no concern with the State, and at the same time it gave the Church full occupation, which did not suffer her energies to slacken. But after Constantine the State assumed a friendly attitude toward the Church, and accepted the Christian profession. In what relation now should the Church place herself to the State? Should she, as hitherto, repel it? On the other hand, how could the Church assume toward it a positive attitude, inasmuch as, agreeably to her idea as Church, she had to see in it, even after it had accepted Christianity, a profane sphere? She could only recognize the State as Christian on one condition; she must render it obsequious to her service. The assumption of this attitude was, moreover, soon forced upon her by the immediate stress of events. In the covenant which the State had concluded with her, she felt herself very soon in many ways prejudiced in her freedom by the outward preponderance of the State, nay, in part injured in her innermost, holiest interests. The Church felt herself soon constrained into an unworthy dependence on the State. She could not but vindicate her freedom, and seek to extricate herself from the civil power. This could only be accomplished *by bringing the State under her own power.* In brief, the Church, especially in the West, proposed to herself *Dominion over the State* as the goal of all her endeavors, at first as constrained, then on principle, out of the consciousness of her own idea. This question outweighed all other interests, whether the Church could *practically* carry through her constitutive idea or not. Especially did the theoretical, strictly theological interests, retire. She required the complete concentration of her energy at *one* point. The idea of the *centrum unitatis*, which is implied in the very idea of the Church, now presents itself in its full significance. If this *centrum unitatis* was to be a power over against the State, this power must be *unlimited*, unlimited also, *in the Church itself.* The ecclesiastical Primacy of the Roman bishop must be intensified into the PAPACY. This stood in conflict with the original idea of the Episcopate, on which the Church had been founded. The plenipotentiary authority, which belonged to the totality of the Bishops *in solidum*, was transferred to the Primate personally, and thereby the remaining bishops were *in fact* degraded. Thus with the Papacy the Catholic Church fell away from the idea on which she had been founded. But this was historically necessary, the condition of her self-preservation. It also offered a practical convenience. After the Church had so increased externally, and included nations so different, some such arrangement was an indispensable condition of a unitary church government. In conflict with the State there constituted itself a veritable Ecclesiastical State. Such a body can only be governed absolutistically. This explains the antithesis of the Episcopal and the Curial system within the Catholic Church. The former alone corresponds to the Idea of the Church, but it can never carry through its claims, because it is wholly unpractical in the actual situation of the Church.

Meanwhile there developed themselves in the inner life of the Church more and more consistently and variously the consequences, which are involved in the nature of the ecclesiastical development of Christianity, especially the legalistic character, Pelagianism, the magico-theurgic view of the appropriation of Redemption, and in connection with it the multiplication of the sacraments and the *opus operatum*. Christianity assumed in the Church ever more completely the form, which we have derived *a priori* from the conception of ecclesiastical Christianity. But now it also came to light, that that position itself, from which the whole development of Christianity had hitherto flowed, stands in inner conflict with the essence of Christianity. This necessarily involved a courageous breach with the whole previous historical development of Christianity and its principle. It involved a REFORMATION. This fact of the Reformation propounded to the earlier Church the question, whether she would even thenceforth still persist in herself—*i.e.*, in *conscious* contradiction to Christianity itself. When now in view of this question the ancient Church in her leading organs decided affirmatively, when she *consciously* sanctioned as Christianity what had been unveiled by history as Spurious Christianity, then first was the present, the veritable, the ROMAN Catholicism born. That the ruling organs of the Church could make such a decision, without thereby apostatizing *fundamentally* from Christianity, results from the fact that the new apprehension of Christianity, which broke forth in the Church, was, from the beginning, indeed really until now, not yet clear as to its own meaning and tendency, and therefore, to the elder in itself very clear idea of Catholic Christianity, could oppose only a very unclear Protestant idea of Christianity. When now the ancient Catholic Church, over against the Reformation, decided to maintain herself, it presented itself at once as her next and unavoidable task, to gain an *intellectual* consciousness of her own Idea in full clearness and distinctness in its characteristic antagonism to the new Reformation idea of Christianity, and in the thus newly-gained light of this her own idea, as a standard, to test thoroughly her whole historically inherited condition, in order to put away from her every heterogeneous element which might in the course of so long a history have casually attached itself to her, and finally, after this self-sifting and self-purification, to express doctrinally her now distincter consciousness concerning herself. This necessity, indeed, must soon have supervened intrinsically. This necessity the Catholic Church complied with at the COUNCIL OF TRENT. At this Occidental Catholicism gave itself its definitive form. This Tridentine Catholicism stands forth in our time as a heterogeneous phenomenon, as an exotic growth. It must in its nature ignore the whole historical crisis through which the Middle Age has passed over into the modern time, and indeed ignore the whole modern form of the life of Christendom. It remains naïvely standing—with an *artificial* naïveness, it is true—on the position of the Middle Ages, notwithstanding that this has long become an antiquity. Its view of the world is essentially the mediæval, little suited as this is to the world in which it moves. Therefore also its system is so full of empty abstractions, that knock all simple human understanding on the head, and by means of sophisms are placed in a transiently illusory light. The Roman Catholic system rests upon some few comprehensive premises, which securely include every detail. These foundation views are absolutely foreign to the cultivated consciousness of our time, which, of itself, would never dream of propounding them. The Catholic Church herself is shy of bringing them into the light. Clearly and definitely expressed, they would revolt the consciousness of the present in its deepest ground (especially their theurgic magic). On the other hand, in mystic *chiaro oscuro* they work so much more strongly the less distinctly it is known what it is which effects this operation. They do not admit of proof, but only of assumption. To do so tacitly is the astute practice of the Catholic Church. It belongs, therefore, to the essence of the Catholic Church that she pronounces judgment upon herself.

(*To be continued.*)

ENGLISH MONASTICISM IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

1. *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.* By FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, Monk of the Order of St. Benedict. 2 vols. (London, 1888.)
2. *Visitations of the Diocese of Norwich, 1492–1532.* Edited by Rev. A. JESSOPP, D.D. (Camden Society, 1888.)
3. *Calendar of Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.* Vol. XI. Edited by JAMES GAIRDNER. (London, 1888.)

From *The Church Quarterly Review*, London, January, 1890.

THE religious orders of the Reformation time have had a very unfortunate fate. Not only were they summarily turned out of their comfortable quarters and reduced to poverty, but they were scandalously abused and defamed. And almost ever since the period of their first troubles this abuse has been repeated and re-echoed. Of late years, however, a reaction has set in. It has now become the fashion, not only not to abuse the monastic bodies of the past, but rather to laud and magnify them, and to give them credit for a large amount of virtue and utility. This has been carried to a great excess by some quasi-historical writers. We welcome, therefore, gladly an historian of their own order, who has dedicated two handsome volumes to the account of English monasticism in the days of Henry VIII. In this well-written and carefully-executed work we shall find none of the absurd exaggerations in which some writers have indulged, but, for the most part, an eminently fair and careful presentment of facts. "It would be affectation," writes Mr. Gasquet, "to suggest that the vast regular body in England was altogether free from grosser faults and immoralities" (i. 38); but he adds: "Anything like general immorality was altogether unknown among the religious of England" (*ibid.*). We are prepared to acquiesce in both these propositions; at the same time we are of opinion —an opinion formed from sources which Mr. Gasquet himself accepts as trustworthy —that the moral decadence of the monasteries was somewhat more serious than he is prepared to admit; that laxity of observance was the rule and not the exception; and that monasticism had so completely outlived its day that its suppression by some means or other was inevitable.

It would be difficult to find a better sketch of the condition of things in Church and State in the early days of Henry VIII. than that which is given in Mr. Gasquet's first chapter. The corruption and inefficiency of the Church, and the miserable state of the population, as these are sketched for us in Dean Colet's famous sermon, and Sir T. More's *Utopia*, are freely accepted by him. All things were crying aloud for a reformation. What form was this reformation to take? Could it be brought about by the monasteries, supposing them to be reduced to the primitive pattern, and to be abodes of zeal and devotion? By the very nature of the case this was impossible. For in proportion as monastic bodies are observant, so are they withdrawn from any contact with the outside world, and utterly incapacitated from influencing the general mass of the population. This was the persuasion of the wisest and best-judging men of that and of previous periods. Hence monasteries were no longer founded, but instead of them, great men sought to found colleges, and, on the general principles of utility to the community, thought it not amiss that the revenues of some of the most manifestly useless religious houses should be diverted to this more profitable channel. Such an arrangement does not, naturally, altogether commend itself to a Benedictine monk, and accordingly we have in chapter iii. a studied attempt to depreciate and vituperate Cardinal Wolsey. In thus running counter to the almost unanimous verdict of modern historians, Mr. Gasquet shows the courage of his opinions. He also shows his historical instinct, for it is certain that Cardinal Wolsey, more than any other man, was the author of the design for the total suppression of monasteries. With him Thomas Crumwell learnt his lesson, and the King was only too ready to give ear to his advice. "Wolsey's Bull for the wholesale dissolution of small monasteries," writes Professor Creighton, "was the beginning of a process which did not cease till all were swept away."* Very interesting chapters are to be found in this volume on the Nun of Kent, the Observant Franciscans, and the Carthusians. In all these cases the savage spirit of King Henry and his advisers, the craft and duplicity of Thomas Crumwell, and the ready truckling of many, of whom better things might have been hoped, stand out in melancholy prominence. But, though the tints are subdued, there is nevertheless a colour given to the whole narrative by the skilful hand of Mr. Gasquet which is liable to convey somewhat false impressions. He would have us accept the statements of M. Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador, as though they gave an impartial account of affairs, instead of a narrative carefully cooked and seasoned for his master's palate; and he even ventures to quote, and that frequently, Nicholas Sanders as an authority, quite in the style of the late William Cobbett. The sad tale of the Carthusians, the miseries of which can hardly be exaggerated, has been told still more recently by a modern brother of the order, and, were there nothing else to stamp the proceedings of Henry with indelible disgrace, this alone would be sufficient. Mr. Gasquet appears to be in error as to the number of the religious bodies which took the oath of the supremacy of the king and of renunciation of the Pope. He says: "The commissioners appear to have met with only partial success," and in a note puts the number at 105 (i. 248). Henry Wharton, however, declares that he had in his custody no less than 175 such documents, being those for thirteen dioceses, and that he knew where the remainder of the original subscriptions were lodged.† Canon Dixon is probably quite correct in saying, "The oath was taken in almost every chapter-house where it was tendered." The alacrity with which the religious orders hastened to abjure the Pope is no doubt distasteful to Mr. Gasquet, but he must have read the history of monasteries very differently from the way in which we think he has, if he is ignorant of the bitter feeling with which the monasteries regarded the Pope. How could it be otherwise, when all they knew of the "Holy Father" were curses and not blessings, unjust exactions, and heartless oppressions? Mr. Gasquet is justly indignant at the slanders of the visitors of Henry VIII., but was anything much worse said by them of the monasteries of England than was said in the Bull of Pope Innocent VIII. in 1489, ordering a visitation of the monasteries, which declares that it had been represented to him that the inmates of many monasteries in England led a lascivious and dissolute life, to the destruction of their souls, the offence of the Divine Majesty, and the disgrace of religion?*

The poor monks, indeed, in rejoicing in their freedom from the Pope, little knew what was before them. The petty persecutions and trying harassments to which they were subjected during the visitation of Crumwell's agents are well sketched in this volume, and illustrated by many quotations from the Calendars.

> "We have very little information," writes Mr. Gasquet, "as to the misery and depth of anxiety which must have prevailed in the cloisters of England during this period. Their forebodings and communings with themselves on the events that were taking place around them must have been sad enough. It requires little stretch of the imagination to picture the dismay and consternation with which the religious must have listened to the reports of violence and injustice, which were carried to them as the visitors proceeded with their work. For years they had endeavoured to buy off the fatal day of doom by plentiful bribes to Crumwell and his master. On what was left to them they with difficulty supported their own existence and maintained the hospitality and relief of the poor which their traditional obligations required" (i. 283).

When, however, we find it set down as one of the greatest of their grievances that they were compelled to remain within the bounds of the monastery, we must remember that this was that to which they themselves were pledged, and the utter neglect of which had brought great scandal upon them and called forth repeated injunctions from their episcopal visitors. We should not quote these had not Mr. Gasquet expressly said in several places that he is quite willing that the actual state of the monasteries should be judged by the entries in the episcopal registers. "It is not too much to regard the evidence furnished in the pages of these episcopal registers as giving a faithful picture of the state of the religious houses" (i. 36). Now in the Register of John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, we have a good many injunctions to nunneries in the years 1530–31. From those addressed to Elstow, or Ulnestowe, we find that there was absolutely no enclosure of the sisters; that they went and came as they pleased; that many of them did not attend the chapel services; that they indulged in smart dresses, having high head-gear with cornered crests, and embroidered dresses with scarlet belts, and ornamented shoes, "the veil thrown back like lay folk." The nuns of Nun Cottam are censured for being very remiss in their services, for great disorders in the house, the Lord of Misrule being allowed to be introduced, and men dressed up as nuns. The sisters are said to "wander about in the world," from which had arisen "many inconveniences, insolent behaviour, and much slander." The injunctions to Studley represent the same state of things—nuns gadding about, sisters bringing strangers into the house, great debts, corrodies granted unnecessarily, a superfluity of servants. We do not wish to assert that the strict enclosure enforced by Crumwell's visitors was in reality done with a view to restore discipline, but merely to suggest that the religious had put themselves out of court for complaining of it. The religious had, in fact, abolished their own system, and by the laxity and neglect of their rules, which everywhere prevailed, had made the way easy for the tyrannical and heartless treatment which was inflicted on them. Had it been otherwise the country would never have endured the dissolution of the monasteries as it did. As a matter of fact it cared marvellously little about it. The risings in the North, which are generally supposed to have been due to indignation at the suppression of the religious houses, had really but little connexion with this, as we shall show farther on. Mr. Gasquet is very indignant with the sweeping and atrocious accusations brought against the monks in order to pass the Bill of Suppression. He does not think that a "Black Book" ever existed, but as the same sort of charges are found in the *Comperta* which actually remain, this is of no great importance. That such a vile indictment should have been openly brought against a large body of men and women without proof, and on the bare assertion of interested men, is one of the scandals of history; but does Mr. Gasquet make his case the better when he brings on the other side a laborious accusation of venality, corruption, and utter want of principle against the whole Parliament which passed the Bill? He would excuse the monks by accusing the nation. Does he actually believe that that Bill would ever have been passed, or that shameful indictment been tolerated, if those members of Parliament had not been individually cognizant of a certain amount of monkish scandals and *laches,* and if they had not been practically aware that the "religious life" had become a pretence and a farce, and that strict rules and ascetic living were almost unknown? When Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, was thinking of founding a monastery, his friend Oldham, Bishop of Exeter, wrote to him to urge him rather to found a college, for, he said, the state of the monastic bodies was so rotten that they must needs soon be swept away. So thought the nation. The thing had to be done; the mischief was that it was done in such a scandalous way. The question of the actual amount of immorality to be found in the religious bodies at the time of the dissolution of course occupies a large space in Mr. Gasquet's work. He does not contend for angelic purity, or for absolute exemption from scandals. He is quite willing to be judged by the bishops' registers. Indeed he specially refers to the Episcopal Registers of Norwich to refute the accusations made by Legh and Ap Rice against the houses in that diocese (i. 355). Now when Mr. Gasquet made this reference, was he aware of what those Episcopal Registers of Norwich did actually contain? They have lately been published by Dr. Jessopp for the Camden Society, and it is well that some of the statements contained in them should be weighed, in order to arrive at a right understanding of the real condition of the religious houses at this period. We give, accordingly, Dr. Jessopp's *résumé* of the condition of some of the chief East Anglian houses, as deduced from these visitations:—

---

* *Thomas Wolsey*, p. 142.

† Collier, iv. 264.

* Wilkins, *Concil.* iii. 631. A similar order had been made, on like grounds, by Gregory IX. in 1234. As an effect of the Papal order of 1489 came the revelation of the shocking state of the monastery of St. Alban's.

"*St. Mary's, Wymondham, Benedictine Priory.*

"In the whole course of its history we hear little or nothing to the credit of the house or its inmates. The buildings were scandalously out of repair, there was scarcely the appearance of any discipline, there was hardly a pretence of learning and devotion maintained. For ages it seems that the Wymondham monks had been an unruly and disorderly set, and as they had been so they seemed disposed to continue. The condition of the monastery was disgraceful. There were free fights in the cloister; the brethren went in and out as they chose; the prior behaved like a madman; the servants were insolent; and, worse than all, more than one or two disgraceful instances of habitual drunkenness were reported; and there were grave suspicions of improper intimacies with women who obtained admission to the monastery." *

The Priory of Westacre (Austin Canons) is referred to by Mr. Gasquet (i. 351) as a house that had been grievously slandered by

---

* Dr. Jessopp's Introduction, pp. xiv., xv.

Crumwell and his agents. We turn to the reports of the episcopal visitations of this house as summarized by Dr. Jessopp. We find that in 1526 Bishop Nicke "found things very bad indeed." Again, at a subsequent visitation matters had not improved. There had been a terrible moral scandal, but on this we do not dwell. Dr. Jessopp appears to us to fairly estimate the case when he says that, if we had full information,

> "we should find in the records of the last eighty years of the Priory of Westacre the history of the decline and fall of an Augustinian monastery, which was doing good work at the end of the fifteenth century, but which . . . in thirty years had become hopelessly deteriorated. It is difficult to see how such an institution could ever have recovered its character, or ever again have become what it had been." *

Mr. Gasquet especially commends "the severity of discipline and the mortified mode of life of this order" (Austin Canons) (i. 73). If, however, he will allow us to draw his attention to some of the episcopal utterances as to houses of this order he must, we think, confess that there were some remarkable exceptions. We have already alluded to Westacre, by far the richest house in East Anglia. What will he say to the following account of St. Mary's, Walsingham, of the same order?

> "Of all the religious houses in the diocese the famous Priory of Walsingham seems to have been the most disorderly and demoralized. The moral and religious state of the community was disgraceful in the extreme. The prior was living a dissolute and scandalous life. He robbed the treasury of money and jewels; he went about in the dress of a layman; he kept a fool to amuse himself and his friends with his buffoonery; he was commonly believed to be keeping up an illicit connexion with the wife of one of his servants; he behaved towards his canons with the utmost violence and brutality; and the result was that the canons themselves were a dissipated, noisy, quarrelsome set, among whom the very pretence of religion was hardly kept up. There were evil reports everywhere, and not without foundation; for the canons frequented the taverns in the town and worse places, and hawked and hunted and occasionally fought, and scaled the walls and got out of bounds at forbidden hours. Some broke into the prior's cell and stole his wine, and some sat up all night drinking, and rolled into chapel and fell asleep and snored. It is a shocking picture, and it is evident that it is not coloured too highly." †

Again we ask did Mr. Gasquet really know what was in these episcopal registers when he appealed to them to confute the reports of Crumwell's visitors, or did he draw a bow at a venture? Before we leave this diocese we must say that the account of the great Abbey of Norwich is almost, if not quite, as bad as that of Walsingham, and that Hulme and some other houses seem to have been very like hunting establishments, the number of dogs kept within the walls being grievously complained of by the more sober monks. To illustrate a little more the alleged exceptional excellence of the Austin Canons, we pass to the diocese of Lincoln. From Bishop Longland's injunctions to the well-known Abbey at Leicester in 1532, we gather that the abbot had not said Mass in the Church for three years, and had not celebrated High Mass on festal days for ten years; that he, too, like the Prior of Walsingham, kept a fool (scurra), who marched at the head of the canons when they went to chapel, "et in choro, cum tu ibidem existis, se stolidè exercet, verbis, derisionibus, cantilenis, ac alias, canonicis in choro occasionem risûs et dissolucionis manifestè prebens." It is hard to conceive such a state of things existing in a religious house. But there it is, under the bishop's hand, in a leading and conspicuous monastery—the house in which Cardinal Wolsey died. There are in this document two charges of immorality against individual monks, but these need not be quoted. We pass to Dorchester, another Austin house. Of this, the Bishop says that he has found certain abuses in it daily practised, which if they be not at once remedied it is to be feared that the monastery will suffer great mischief both in temporals and spirituals. We are much inclined to doubt whether the Austin Canons were better than the other "religious." Dr. Jessopp says their discipline was not so strict as that of the monks. He adds, "There were some Augustinian houses where the canons were living a harmless, pleasant life in society, much as fellows of Oxford or Cambridge." * We imagine this to have been very much the state of the case. The canons were about as useless as the monks. Bishop Longland absolutely prohibited the canons of Dorchester from serving parochial churches belonging to them, which was always to be done by secular clergy. If we turn over the annals of Dunstable, we may see how the canons of that troublesome house were hated by the townspeople and their neighbours. We are unable to discern anything which should make the country very anxious to retain either monks or canons for any special good they got from them. But it will be said that the doles to the poor were extremely valuable. This is a subject on which great misapprehension exists.

---

* Dr. Jessopp's Introduction, p. xxxv.

† *Ibid.* p. xxxvi.

* Dr. Jessopp's Introduction, p. xxx.

The monasteries—the greater ones especially—were almost all in retired spots, far away from the centres of population. How could Fountains, or Furness, or Tintern, or Bolton, or Rievaulx benefit any great amount of the population by their doles of bread and beer ? Yet we have what we can only designate as the clap-trap sentimental utterance by Mr. Gasquet : "Every pauper is made to feel, by the cold charity extended to him in the poorhouses of the country, how cruelly he was robbed of his inheritance, by the destruction and spoliation of the monastic houses of the land" (i. 395). If the monks were such efficient distributers of charity, how comes it to pass that the country people were in such a miserable state of semi-starvation as they are depicted by this writer, when he desires to lower the character of the period which tolerated the great iniquity of the suppression ? Mr. Gasquet might have saved himself the trouble of penning the laboured invective against Crumwell and his subordinates to be found in chapters x. xi. Nobody now defends these men, or doubts their venality, corruption, and falsehood. But when this writer speaks with perhaps a justifiable exultation of Crumwell's fall, he might have noted the extreme injustice of it. The unscrupulous minister was condemned by the remorseless tyrant whom he served for the very acts to which he had been encouraged by the king ; just as Wolsey was condemned for using the legatine authority which he had licence to use under the king's sign manual.

The second volume of Mr. Gasquet's history contains much interesting matter. He regrets that it was finished before the publication of Mr. Gairdner's eleventh volume of the *Calendar of State Papers ;* but, notwithstanding this disadvantage, it is full of gleanings from state documents illustrating the rising in Lincolnshire, the Pilgrimage of Grace, and the dissolution of the various religious houses. Having had the opportunity of carefully inspecting Mr. Gairdner's volume, we have arrived at the conclusion that the dissolution of the religious houses had but very little to do with the risings in the North, and that the dispossessed monks took no prominent part therein, which makes the atrocious vengeance taken upon them for what they certainly could not help all the more unjustifiable. That the suppression of monasteries was thrown in as one of the grounds of complaint made by the rebels is doubtless true ; but it does not appear to have been the originating cause of the movement, nor to have been the chief thing regarded in it. The risings were mainly due to the influence of the secular clergy and the fear of losing the "jewels" of the churches, and in a lesser degree to the fear of the laity of having new burdens placed upon them. These movements, therefore, can hardly be used as a proof of the popularity of the religious houses, or of the deep affection felt for them. Mr. Gasquet says very fairly :—

> "It is impossible to inspect the depositions of witnesses and examinations of prisoners on this matter without a conviction that the men of Lincolnshire rose in arms in defence of what they held to be matters of both Christian faith and practice" (ii. 49).

We shall endeavour to illustrate our position by some extracts from the careful summary of State papers in Mr. Gairdner's volume. On Sunday, October 1, 1536, there was a great gathering of the Lincolnshire clergy at Louth. The commissary of the Chancellor of the diocese was to meet them the next day, to assess their benefices for the payment of the half-subsidy due, to give them the Articles and Injunctions lately passed, and to inquire into their ability and readiness to preach as directed. There was a very strong feeling among them. They were not willing to accept the religious changes. They were not willing to have a fresh assessment made for their benefices. They objected, above all, to any inquiry as to their preaching powers. They had heard some disagreeable reports. Dr. Raynes, the Chancellor, was lying ill at Bolingbroke ; but he had held a visitation the day before for the clergy of that deanery, and certain priests from Louth had been present, "to see what order the bishop's chancellor would take," and they had come back declaring that "they would not be so ordered or examined in their learning."* The laymen were also expecting on the morrow a visit from the king's proctor, to assess them for their subsidy, and were therefore quite ready to listen to the discontented parsons. Accordingly, speeches were made to them by the clergy, declaring that the jewels and ornaments of the churches were to be taken by the king, and only one church in five miles was to be left. Excited by this the men of Louth proceeded to take the keys of the jewel-chests from the churchwardens with force and violence. They chose as captain a cobbler named Nicholas Melton, and set a guard to watch the church all night.†

> "The priests were the occasion of this business. The parsons of Stewton, Manby, and Welton gave them money. The parson of Helloff offered them

---

* *Calendar of Papers of Henry VIII.*, xi. No. 975.

† *Ibid.* Nos. 968–970.

40*l.*, and the parsons of Somercokes and Welton and dean of Muckton encouraged them."[*]

The upshot of this was that when the bishop's commissary arrived on the Monday he was mobbed and his books were burned. The clergy then hastened off to their several parishes to rouse their people. On Tuesday, October 3, they mustered at Caistor, twenty thousand strong. Then they seized the gentry, and made them swear to be true to their cause, and Lord Burgh having escaped, they hanged his servant. All the books relating to the subsidies were burned, and about eightscore priests joined the movement.[†] At the neighbouring town of Horncastle things were proceeding even more fiercely. Here the unfortunate Chancellor, who had been dragged from his sick-bed at Bolingbroke, was savagely murdered.[‡] They also hanged one Wolsey, principally, it would seem, on account of his name, and nearly murdered other officials. A banner was now constructed and a proclamation put forth, and the insurgents, drawing large contingents from all quarters, prepared to march on Lincoln. With all this the monks had nothing to do. Dr. Makarel, Abbot of Barlings, who appears afterwards as a leader, did not join the movement till the Thursday, and then upon compulsion.[§] Henry Thornben, cellarer of Barlings, deposes:

> "Heard that church jewels should be taken; and after that all cattle unmarked should be confiscated. Thinks that the cause of the insurrection. Never saw ruler of religious house in the host, except his master. Saw monks of Bardney and Kirksted, and a canon, late of Welbek, and many priests."[‖]

Want of space prevents us following up the movement to its termination, but it may be observed that in the list of the grievances put forward by the insurgents there is no mention of the dissolution of the monasteries. Their alleged grievances are: (1) That every man is to bring his gold to have the touch of the Tower; (2) that there is only to be a church for every five miles, and that all the chalices, jewels, &c., are to be taken; (3) that every man is to be sworn as to the amount of his substance, and if this be found more his goods are to be taken; (4) that no man shall eat white bread, goose, or capon without paying a "certain" to the king; (5) that a noble is to be paid for every wedding, burying, or christening; (6) that all cloth is to be brought to a certain place and sealed, and if it "go in or shrink" the goods of the maker to be forfeited.[*] This was evidently completely a rising of the peasantry and yeomen, stirred up by the clergy.

Of the far more important rising in Yorkshire, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, which assumed almost the proportions of civil war, we have not left ourselves much space to speak. In the twenty-four demands put forward by the "Parliament at Pontefract," the restitution of the monasteries forms one item, and that of the Friars Observant another.[†] But the twenty-two other singular demands show that this, too, was completely a movement of the clergy and the occupiers of land, and testify to the profound disgust with which the whole policy of Henry VIII. was regarded. In the king's terms offered to the insurgents nothing is said about the restoration of the monasteries, neither does this appear to have been insisted on by them. After his return from London we find Robert Aske, the leader, visiting some of the abbeys to which the religious had returned, and arranging that for a time the king's farmers should be reinstated in their charges.[‡] We are inclined to believe that, could the insurgents have obtained the other concessions they desired, they would have been quite willing to abandon the monasteries. The monks were neither the movers in the revolt, nor in any special way the cause of the movement. Yet upon these unfortunate men the savage vengeance of the king principally fell. Mr. Gasquet examines at length the king's assertion that "all these troubles have ensued by the solicitation and traitorous conspiracies of the monks and canons of those parts," and shows clearly enough that this assertion is false. Yet there came forth that brutal order from the king to the Duke of Norfolk: "We desire you at such places as they have conspired, or kept their houses with force since the appointment at Doncaster, you shall without pity or circumstance cause all the monks and canons that be in any wise faulty to be tied up without further delay or ceremony."[§] "There can be no doubt," writes Mr. Gasquet, "that the abbots and monks now tried and put to death fell victims to Henry's cupidity and sanguinary vengeance, and that they did not suffer for their own misdeeds" (ii. 158). Treachery and breach of promises were added to cruelty. The promises made by Henry's generals during the insurrection were not regarded, and everywhere terror and confusion prevailed. It is impossible to read the chapters in which Mr. Gasquet details the circumstances of the suppression of the various abbeys, as extracted from ancient documents, with graphic skill and power, but with no exaggerated denunciations, without feeling the deepest sympathy and pain for these oppressed people.

---

[*] *Calendar of Papers of Henry VIII.*, xi. Nos. 970–972.
[†] *Ibid.* No. 283.
[‡] Gasquet, ii. 63.
[§] *Calendar of Papers of Henry VIII.*, xi., No. 805.
[‖] *Ibid.* 828, No. vi.

[*] *Calendar of Papers of Henry VIII.*, 768, 2.
[†] *Ibid.* No. 1246.
[‡] Gasquet, ii. 125.
[§] *State Papers of Henry VIII.*, i. 537.

One thing, however, we must observe, which certainly does not tend to raise the character of the "religious" of that day, though it may be excusable under the circumstances. "The final catastrophe of Woburn was hastened," writes Mr. Gasquet, "through the malicious informations of discontented monks, who here, as in many monasteries of England at this time, served Crumwell as spies upon the acts and words of their superiors and brethren" (ii. 193). In connexion with this may be noted the fact, which appears in many of the bishops' injunctions, that wranglings and bitterness and quarrels were by no means unknown in many monasteries. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? A number of undisciplined and ignorant men, thrown together in the closest intercourse, and constantly subjected to the same vexatious rules, might naturally be expected to be somewhat inharmonious, and apt at tale-bearing and petty intrigues. To judge from the Injunctions this state of things was also not unknown in the nunneries. But there is really no case against the nuns on the ground of immorality. Out of the 140 convents of women at the time of the dissolution only twenty-seven nuns in all of them are charged with vice.* In the Norwich visitations only one nun is noted for a lapse. A worse case, indeed, than any in the visitors' reports is noted of the Convent of Littlemore in Bishop Attewell's visitation book. But these few cases prove nothing against the whole body, and the cruelty of ejecting these poor women, many of whom were aged and infirm, is something hideous and repulsive.

> "The nun's lot," writes Mr. Gasquet, "had no such ray of consolation as that of the monk. Even had the circumstances attending her dismissal from conventual life been more fortunate, or the result of her own act or choice, her future must have been dark and uncertain, since the vows which bound her heart and conscience must keep her always apart from the secular surroundings in which she was compelled to exist" (ii. 203).

But amidst our earnest sympathy for the nuns we must not lose sight of common sense. When Mr. Gasquet dwells upon the blessing given to the country by the teaching of the nuns, it should be remembered that this "teaching" was by no means provided for "the youthful poor," but for the daughters of great families, who came and dwelt in the nunneries, and paid the sisters handsomely. And when to "the *bounty* of these religious ladies" it is said that a great number of secular clergy owed their position, as the "titles" in the registers show, this is really a little too much. The monasteries, both male and female, had for centuries been filching from the secular clergy their lawful maintenance, had been acquiring appropriations of churches, which often, until compelled by the bishops to act otherwise, they had left without any pastoral care. The convents could, of course, in no case furnish this care of themselves. When, then, they appoint a chaplain, under episcopal threats, to minister in one of the churches whose tithes they had stolen, this is called their bounty!* We are compelled, by want of space, to pass over the chapter on the fall of the friars, once so popular in England, but long before their fall the objects of unmitigated satire and contempt; and also the extremely interesting chapter on the three Benedictine Abbots of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester. That Mr. Gasquet should feel deeply and write strongly on the cruelty and rapacity of the dissolution, the abominable desecration of holy things, and the horrors which were rampant everywhere, is only what was to be expected, and almost everyone will sympathize with him now. But this is no reason why he should make such absolutely unhistorical statements as the following:—

> "Little by little the broad acres and ecclesiastical benefices, upon the revenues of which not only had the monks and nuns subsisted, but which had served to support the poor, aged and sick of the country, and for other public and national purposes, passed away into private hands without having contributed any substantial advantage to the country or crown, and unburdened by any condition of service to the commonwealth or particular district, which had hitherto characterized its tenure" (ii. 392).

Upon this marvellous sentence we have to remark, first, that if the monks were living on the revenues of ecclesiastical benefices, they were living on that which they had obtained by robbery and injustice; secondly, that they did not support the poor, aged and sick of the country, or how could such a state of things have existed as Sir T. More sketches in his *Utopia* (1516), or, as Mr. Gasquet himself has described in the earlier part of his work? thirdly, that the monks did almost absolutely nothing for

---

* Gasquet, ii. 205.

* Gasquet, ii. 221.

" public and national purposes," but by engaging a number of able-bodied persons in a useless life, and being exempted from the ordinary taxation, thwarted and checked them ; fourthly, that it is not true that the monastic property when alienated did not contribute any substantial advantage to the country or crown, as Mr. Gasquet has himself shown in the next chapter ; fifthly, that it is absurd to say that the new holders were unburdened by any condition of service to the commonwealth, inasmuch as they were citizens subject to the ordinary laws and burdens of the State, from which the monks escaped. Mr. Gasquet no doubt can see no especial virtue in the character and spirit of the English country gentleman, which came out with such vigour in the next generation, scattering the feeble designs of popes and monks, Spanish armadas, and bulls of deposition ; but Englishmen are not likely to forget it, nor to fail to connect it very distinctly with the raising and strengthening of so many country families by the monastic lands.

We can admire very cordially this work. It is a monument of patient and careful research, it is admirably written, and for the most part eminently fair. But the general conclusions as to the value of monastic institutions, and as to the mischief accruing to the country by their extinction, seem to us to be absolutely ludicrous. We have studied the history of many of these institutions, and what do we find to be the most familiar topics and incidents ? Constant aggressions on their neighbours, constant lawsuits, unceasing endeavours to get hold of advowsons and to farm churches, unscrupulous resistance to the bishops' visitations, and, in later times, utter disregard of their rules. That monasteries had done much good in their earlier days—that the Cistercians had improved land, the Benedictines preserved and executed many admirable manuscripts, the Carthusians exhibited a wonderful and constant asceticism and a very high tone of devotion, we don't deny. We utterly repudiate the slanders of the *Black Book* and the *Comperta.* We believe that the average rate of morality among monks and nuns was a fair one. But as to their usefulness, their value to the country, we are altogether at issue with their able defender. They were an absolute obstruction to all progress, and they needed to be removed. That this was done in so shocking a manner, and with so many circumstances of shame and horror, has no doubt tended to cause a strong reaction in their favour in these days, when the history of the reign of Henry VIII. may be said to have been opened for the first time. But to the calm judgment the main issue remains the same, however picturesque, romantic, and touching may be the details with which it is surrounded.

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR, D.D.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), February, 1890.

It is not of my own accord that I write these few words on the great and good Bishop—the great scholar, the great theologian—whom death has taken from us at the comparatively early age of sixty-two. Although I have known and loved him for more than thirty-five years, there are many far better qualified than I am to pay their tribute of affection and gratitude to his honoured memory. All that I can write may be, and will be, inadequate ; and it is only owing to the accidental inability of others, at short notice, to speak of his work and character, that I have consented to express the feelings respecting him which he, at any rate, would not have despised. He was my private tutor at college. He presented me with all his books in succession as they were printed. I heard from him not unfrequently. He did me the honour to ask for such small help as I could render to good causes in which he felt an interest, more often than I was able to obey his call. I dedicated to him the best of the poor books which I have written, and when I sent him anything of mine it always evoked kind words, and sometimes kind suggestions. I tried to offer him " the shadow of a wreath of honour," which he did not need from me when he was living ; I trust that I may at least be pardoned if I here offer to him, now that he is dead, the shadow of that wreath of grateful acknowledgment which he needs still less. I do not pretend to be able to reach high enough to place it on the forehead of his statue ; but

> " Ut caput in magnis ubi non est tangere signis
> Ponitur hic imos ante corona pedes."

No doubt his biography will be written by some competent and sympathetic hand ; but, as in the case of his great and like-minded predecessor, Bishop Joseph Butler, he needs a biography less than most men. The facts of his inner life were revealed to few, perhaps fully to none. His letters were usually brief and business-like, and touched but rarely on his deepest feelings. He never " wore his heart on his sleeve for daws to peck at." It will not be possible in his case

"For knave or clown
To hold their orgies at his tomb."

His best biography, his truest monument, is the great simple, unselfish life which the world saw, and the thought and toil accumulated in his books. Beyond such personal incidents as may serve to deepen the influence of his example by illustrating the beautiful consistency and single-mindedness of aim which reigned throughout his life, there is nothing about him to reveal, as there is nothing to conceal. How often have we read biographies of men intimately known to us, in which the chief fact of their history, and some one essential element of their character, has been intentionally or unconsciously omitted? And sometimes this has been the very fact which did most to make or mar their lives, or the one element of character which chiefly influenced their career. No mistake of that kind can happen in the case of the late Bishop of Durham. His career was uneventful in external incidents; the circle of his relations and intimates was small; his aims were definite; his character transparent from marge to marge. He lived a life fortunate and happy beyond what falls to the common lot; a life untroubled by a single tragic circumstance, if we except the prolonged trial of the illness by which he was at last prostrated. But through that long career of unbroken prosperity, in which he rose from the position of a middle-class boy to the enjoyment of a great revenue and the honours of a princely bishopric, he remained always the same strong, sincere, simple man, uninflated by his immense success as he would have been undaunted if it had pleased God to try him with failure. When he had experienced his own eminent capacity for the promotion which had come to him unsought, his friends noted in him what one of them described as a "solemn gladness." But no one ever saw in him the disguised self-satisfaction, the ostentatious condescension, the arrogant mock-humility, the airs of gracious patronage to old equals, which are but too common in smaller natures whom accident, or merit, or the wirepullers of party have elevated to some high position. The friends of his youth, however unfortunate their lot, however humble their circumstances, however unpopular their names, remained his friends. He did not forget them, or ignore them, or show them the cold shoulder, or oppress them with his magnificence, or make them wince under the exhibition of his social superiority. The kindness which he showed as a young graduate to his juniors was maintained when he was a leading Bishop towards all worthy presbyters or curates. The generosity which led him to give a large sum when he was a Cambridge professor to the reredos of St. Mary's, made him spend his income with exemplary munificence, and build and endow the Church of St. Ignatius at Sunderland when he became Bishop of Durham.

It is this unity of his life which is one of its most beautiful characteristics. The prayer of Lightfoot must have ever been that of Wordsworth:—

"My heart leaps up when I behold
A rainbow in the sky;
So was it when my life began;
So is it now I am a man;
So be it when I shall grow old,
Or let me die.
The child is Father of the Man;
And I could wish my days to be
Bound each to each by natural piety."

And that prayer was granted. There have been men whose youth, "full of idle noise," was in sharp contrast with their manhood; but at no period of life was Bishop Lightfoot unworthy of himself. It could never be said of him "*Dissimiles hic vir et ille puer.*" In this wholeness and wholesomeness of his life he resembled the great poet whose death was so nearly simultaneous with his own, to whom he once sought an introduction in my house, and whom he greatly admired. He would have said with Mr. Browning:—

"Have you found your life distasteful?
My life did and does smack sweet:
Was your youth of pleasure wasteful?
Mine I saved, and hold complete.
Do your joys with age diminish?
When mine fail me I'll complain.
Must in death your daylight finish?
My sun sets to rise again."

There are two lines, characteristic of the poet's view of life and duty, which I think that Bishop Lightfoot would have regarded as expressive also of his own aim and opinion; namely,

"Take one step onward, and secure that step;"

and

"Truth is the strong thing; let man's life be true."

It must not, however, be supposed that there were no elements of gaiety and humour in his character. Those who knew him, and saw him in the unreserve of his lighter hours—those who, even in his later years, have seen him among his "boys" at Auckland Castle—knew how playful he could be.

If any one fancies that Lightfoot never could have been a boy, he is much mistaken. If his character was of a grave cast, it by no means lacked a capacity for fun. Among other anecdotes of his schooldays some of his old comrades still remember how one day his much-loved master, Prince Lee, afterwards Bishop of Manchester, saw him standing on the master's desk, and called out to him, in his quick, energetic way: *κατάβα, κατάβα, κατάβα, κατάβα* !—*Καταβήσομαι*, answered Lightfoot, with a broad smile on his face; imperturbably finishing the Aristophanic line.[*] Dr. Prince Lee has, I think, not found a biographer, but the eminence and warm allegiance of his pupils—among whom we may name, almost as contemporaries, the late Bishop, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dr. Westcott—are among the many proofs of his exceptional power. The greatness of his pupils, as they would be the first to admit, was due in no small measure to the stimulative character of his teaching. His remark, "Ah! B—— *μὴ φοβοῦ μόνον πίστευε*,"[†] still rings in the memory of one of them. His recommendation of Barrow as a model did much to mould the style of another. The one word, *Σαλπίσει*,[‡] which he chose to be carved upon his tomb, has had a potent influence over the imagination of a third. Prince Lee, though very unequal, sometimes spoke with great eloquence; and I remember a sentence of his,[§] the spirit of which he must have breathed into the studies of his most promising pupils. It was this: "You must not only listen, but read. You must not only read, but think. Knowledge without commonsense is folly; without method it is waste; without charity it is fanaticism; without religion it is death."

I first made the acquaintance of Dr. Lightfoot when I was an undergraduate at Trinity College, Cambridge, and he was a young Fellow of that foundation. Before I knew him personally I had often heard of him as the Senior Classic who was supposed to have sent up papers without a single mistake; and I remember how, night after night, the steady lamp might be seen burning in the window of his room, and youths would point to it and say, "There is the great Lightfoot steadily at work." It was in one of the Long Vacations, when only the scholars and more studious undergraduates were allowed to stay up, that I became his private pupil. Those Long Vacations were truly delightful times, to which many look back as to green islands

> "Across the barren wastes of wandering foam."

I can still recall walks to our afternoon bathe—in the old bathing-shed in the green fields by the River Cam—with him and with others who still live; and in one of those walks I remember the vivid "chaff" which he expended on one of his old schoolfellows, which showed me how much sense of the ludicrous and what powers of sarcasm lay under his quiet exterior and usually shy talk. But the sarcasm was never venomous. It was intended to heal, not to wound. It was

> "Gentle satire kin to charity."

I am not writing an indiscriminate eulogy, and I cannot say that Dr. Lightfoot was at that time specially eminent as a private tutor. It may be that he did not wholly like the drudgery; it may be that he had an unpromising pupil; it may be that his massive scholarship was not best displayed in the Greek and Latin composition which then occupied a disproportionate share of attention. He was always painstaking and conscientious, and he was kindness itself. Other pupils probably gained more from his tuition than I am honestly able to say that I did; but my deepest gratitude to him was due to all that I learned from him in later years, not then. I once offended him—I trust that it was the only time that I did so—by telling him when I got my Fellowship that he might have saved me many gloomy misgivings as an Undergraduate, if the Cambridge system had dealt a little more freely in words of encouragement. I said this, not by way of any personal complaint, but only from the deeply seated conviction on which I have always acted as a principle in education, and which to my knowledge has produced good fruits in the minds of some, that there are youths of diffident temperament, always inclined to undervalue themselves, to whom the total dearth of hopefulness about their own efforts, which their elders and betters might so easily inspire, produced the effects sometimes of mental paralysis, sometimes almost of death.

The secrets of Bishop Lightfoot's great career were the perseverance and the resolution which in the long run achieve greater results than careless genius, and are not liable to the same aberrations. This was remarked in him even as a schoolboy. "What is Joe working at now?" asked one of his school-fellows. "Is he learning German?" "Oh, no," was the reply; "he has done with German, and has gone on to Anglo-

---

[*] Ar. Vesp. 979. [†] Mark v. 36. [‡] 1 Cor. xv. 52.

[§] In a speech at the opening of the Bury Athenæum.

Saxon." In his earlier years he was not regarded so much as a man of brilliant originality and exceptional endowments as a man of untiring industry and indomitable purpose, devoted to the training of great and solid capacities. Thus he—as has often been noticed of another dear friend of past days, Bishop Cotton, of Calcutta—was a man who continually grew in power and ability, adapting himself to every office to which he was called. A favourite line of his old schoolmaster used to be Homer's

" *αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων.*" *

Dr. Lightfoot fully absorbed the first part of the exhortation in the sense of "always doing his utmost, and always being his best;" but I do not think that he ever allowed himself to covet the pre-eminence over others at which Hippolochus enjoined his son Glaucus to aim. For that ambition he would rather have substituted the line of Hesiod, which was so often on the lips of Socrates :—

κὰδ δύναμιν δ' ἔρδειν ἱέῤ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι. †

He put forth his best endeavours not only in matters of religion, but in the routine of daily life. Thus, when he became a Professor at Cambridge, his greatness was immediately established. The immense range of his acquisitions, the earnest efforts to do his work as well as lay in his power, were at once recognized by the Undergraduates. The frequent failure of Professors to win an audience is a matter of common complaint, and men as learned in their own domain as Dr. Lightfoot have not succeeded. But there was something electric in his quick sympathy with the young, in his masculine independence, in his strong practical good sense, in his matchless lucidity of exposition ; and these gifts caused his lecture-room to be thronged by eager listeners. The late Master of Trinity was not given to enthusiasm, but once he did wax enthusiastic, as he described to me the passage between the Senate House and Caius College "black with the fluttering gowns of students" hurrying to imbibe, in the Professor's class-room, a knowledge of the New Testament such as was not open to their less happy predecessors, and such as would last many of them all their lives as a fountain of valuable exegesis in many a parish and many a pulpit.

And, speaking of the pulpit, I will say that Dr. Lightfoot's preaching furnished another illustration of the determination which carried him to excellence in every branch of work which he undertook. When he began to preach he created no striking impression. He had received from Nature none of those gifts of person, and voice, and grace of manner which stand so many orators in good stead. His delivery at that time has been described as dull and monotonous, and he was perhaps conscious of the disadvantages against which he had to struggle. But he completely overcame them. As a *speaker,* indeed, he never attained, as a rule, to what would be called effective oratory, though those who knew what he was, and how impossible it was for him to say anything which was not worthy the best attention, would rather have listened to him than to almost any man. But as a preacher he achieved a greatness which will not be fully recognized until those three volumes of varied sermons are printed which are ready, or nearly ready, for the press. When they see the light, I believe that the general admiration of them will justify an opinion which I have very often expressed, that for massive splendour and majesty of style he was unsurpassed, and that, if matter be infinitely more important than manner, he should have been ranked as one of the first—if not *the* first—preacher in the Church of England. His sermons were often uttered with a suppressed fire which gave them the most powerful effect, and though the meaning of the word "rhetoric" seems to be lost, and that word is now generally used to point a sneer, I will say—using the word in the true and honourable sense —that they were conceived in the finest spirit of rhetoric. Perhaps the first of his sermons which showed to what heights he could attain was that which he preached, after the death of Dr. Whewell, in Trinity College Chapel, in which he described so touchingly how, in the first flush of his utter grief and loneliness, after the death of his wife, the great Master of Trinity "appeared in the chapel to join his prayers with ours, not shrinking from us as from strangers, nor fearing to commit to our sympathies the saddest of all sad sights, an old man's bereavement and a strong man's tears." I should be glad to quote passages from his admirable sermon on "The Father of Missionaries," and from that on "The Vision of God," preached at his enthronement ; or from that on Ezekiel's vision, preached at the opening of the Croydon Church Congress. I have no space for such extracts, and, indeed, I never heard him preach a sermon which was not admirable and weighty. But I may refer to that fine picture of a self-dedicated life, which he sketched at the consecration of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishopric of Truro *—the picture of one who "lays down at the footstool of God his successes and his failures, his hopes and his fears, his knowledge and his ignorance, his weakness and his strength, his misgivings and his confidences—all that he is, and all that he might be—content to take up thence just that which God shall give him."

---

* Hom. Il. vi. 206.

† Hes. Op. 334.

So, again, it was with his work as a Bishop. The old proverb, *ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείϰνυσι* was true in his case. All his ruling and administrative capacity at once came out. He has left his diocese one of the best organized and one of the most united in England. The secret of this success lies in his own words on the day of his enthronement:—"I have but one idea for the administration of the diocese, that we should all strive to work together; that, as we contemplate the awful amount of sin around us, we should one and all resolve to do our best, by God's help, to lessen this gigantic mass of evil, and should be careful not to give or take unnecessary offence at what is done by those who are labouring earnestly and faithfully in the same cause." Under his rule the diocese was divided; the diocesan work flourished; he preached in nearly every church in his diocese. Churches were built; home and foreign missions were promoted. Social efforts of all kinds were set on foot. The dense crowds of pitmen who watched in silence the funeral procession as it passed through Tudhoe and Spennymoor showed how deeply the heart of the people had been touched by the work of the shy scholar who had been transformed into their Prince-Bishop.

This is not the place to attempt any estimate or characterization of the great work which it has been given him to do, although, if it had been possible, I would gladly have touched on the subject. But I may mention one feature which shone conspicuously in every branch of labour which he undertook. It was the exemplary *thoroughness* which showed the ripest fruit of the best form of Cambridge training. Instances crowd upon the memory, but I will content myself with one or two. Fifteen years ago he was asked to read a paper on Missions at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Thousands of such papers have been written which have been forgotten a few weeks at the latest after they were read. But Dr. Lightfoot discharged the duty in such a way that his paper has a permanent value, and is a most important contribution to the literature of missions. It finally swept aside the modern assertion that missions have lost all their ancient efficacy. It showed, with a masterly knowledge which few possess, and which fewer still would have had the patience to concentrate, that the progress of Christianity through the ages has been quite as rapid *in proportion* as it was in the first four centuries. It thus dissipated a sense of discouragement which weighed heavily on many minds, and it gave a fresh impulse to missionary zeal. Take, as another instance, his essays in the editions of St. Paul's Epistles on the meaning of *prætorium*, or of *πλήρωμα*, or on *επιούσιος*, or the dissertations on the Christian ministry, on St. Paul and Seneca, and on the "Brethren of the Lord." Those essays are absolutely exhaustive of the existing materials for forming a judgment. They are specimens of a research which refused to be wearied. Once again, take his edition of the "Epistles of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp." Determined to get to the bottom of every question, and to examine the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles in every possible light, he added Armenian and Coptic to his already vast stores of erudition, with the sole object of examining what could be discovered about the epistles in those languages. Often in steamboat, or railroad carriage, he would be found with an Armenian or Coptic grammar in his hand. And yet, so absolutely unostentatious was this newly acquired learning that a reader might easily go through his book without so much as once noticing the fact. For it is as true of him as of any man that ever lived that he wore

> "the weight
> Of all that learning, lightly as a flower."

He avoided controversy as much as possible, but when he was called upon to perform the functions of a critic, he discharged his duty with rare perfection. One of the first writings which brought him prominently into notice was his criticism in the *Journal of Philology*, of two works by men of genius—the edition of the Epistle to the Corinthians, by Dean Stanley, and of the Epistle to the Romans and Galatians, by the Master of Balliol. Exact scholarship was not of course the *forte* of the beloved and gifted Dean; and minute grammatical and critical precision was not the immediate object of Professor Jowett. Both works were composed from an exegetical standpoint different from that of Dr. Lightfoot, though he was the first to recognize the high and permanent importance of both. We know very well how the criticisms of such works would have been written by the shallow and pretentious cleverness of some small-minded anonymous critic in the ordinary religious, semi-religious, and pseudo-religious journals. Long experience has made us familiar with the tone of superiority which such writers always assume; with their studied depreciations, their unfairness, their determination to ignore every merit, to exaggerate every defect, and not to attempt to understand the real object of the writer whom it is their one aim to injure, to wound, and to write down. Dr. Lightfoot was endowed with a nature, and had attained to a goodness, which could not descend to those abysses of the ignoble. Very far different, and indeed a model of outspoken yet modest, manly, and respectful criticism, was his review. No author could be otherwise than grateful for such corrections. As a matter of fact, Dr. Lightfoot received the cordial thanks both of the Dean and the Professor, who, in later editions, gladly corrected the errors or oversights to which he had called attention. So, too, there was a controversy between Dr. Lightfoot and the present Bishop of Salisbury, on the subject of the famous views of the former upon the Christian ministry; but it was conducted by both bishops with mutual and loving courtesy, and not one word was said by either to pain the feelings, or even to ruffle the susceptibilities of the other. Some may say that in his other chief controversy—that with the author of "Supernatural Religion"—Dr. Lightfoot showed some acerbity. The impression is a mistaken one, as those who read the papers will see. The author of "Supernatural Religion," in his recent reply, makes no such complaint. On the special points of controversy, with which Dr. Lightfoot alone wished to deal, the unknown author had laid himself open to many refutations, and as the issue of the contest was one supremely important in itself, and of consummate interest to the bishop, he did not hesitate to drive his lance home between the joints of his opponent's harness. But if he extenuated nothing, he certainly set down naught in malice. Of insulting language, and of acrimonious personality there is none. There are no venomous sneers, no corroding epigrams, so that in this region again the bishop set a shining and greatly-needed example. *O si sic omnes!*

---

* On St. Mark's Day, 1887.

His attitude as an ecclesiastic is akin to his attitude as a critic. He was a man of large and tolerant mind, who apprehended too seriously the importance of the deeper and more vital questions on which the issues of this age depend, to care much, if he cared at all, about petty squabbles. He had learnt from St. John that the real Anti-Christ is the spirit of faction. It was therefore impossible for him to take any share in the manœuvres or intrigues of partisans. We cannot even conceive of him as condescending to whisper innuendoes against opponents or rivals; or as suffering himself to be actuated by prejudices which induce a colour blindness to all merits of those from whom we differ. Such things were utterly alien to his temperament, and belonged to a region immeasurably below his habitual aspirations. He left such methods to falser aims and meaner spirits.

> "Through the heather an' howe gaed the creepin' thing,
> But abune was the waft of an angel's wing."

When he became a Bishop, there were many who feared that the scholar would be sacrificed to the Church officer, or that episcopal duties would be overbalanced by theological pre-occupations. It was not so. His varied erudition had not been purchased at the cost of practical wisdom. By unswerving diligence, by early rising, by steady use of the fragments of time, he was still able to contribute to the higher branches of scholarly and historic research, while yet he was an active and most useful Prelate. His charity, his tolerance, his magnanimity, tending to the annihilation of all that is petty and Pharisaic, gave to his diocese a singular sense of brotherliness as well as an energy of devoted service. He found time to train gratuitously, in Auckland Castle, a succession of youths, who, having enjoyed the advantage of seeing the daily spectacle of his example, are now, to the number of seventy, working as clergymen in the Church of England. Into two great movements he flung himself with clear-sighted energy. He could not live in the midst of a district inhabited by multitudes of pitmen and miners without observing the ravages of those two great enemies of mankind—intemperance and impurity. He became by choice and conviction a total abstainer and a prominent advocate of temperance legislation. He spoke on this subject with perfect firmness, yet without bigotry, and he wisely said (as every sensible abstainer would say) that, if at any time he could be convinced that his health absolutely required the use of wine, he should then unhesitatingly resume its use, believing the preservation of health to be a primary duty when no *superior* duty demands its sacrifice. Of the White Cross Society he was the president, and, if I mistake not, the principal founder. When he spoke on the platform he showed the power of handling a difficult subject with absolute precision, yet with the most refined delicacy; and we cannot doubt that by his words and his example he has greatly contributed to establish among young men a holier and more chivalrous view of the relations which should prevail between the sexes in a Christian society. He was himself, by deliberate choice, a celibate; probably, among other reasons, because he felt with St. Paul that as matrimony is a most blessed aid in discharging many of life's highest duties, so there are particular vocations to which it may be a hindrance. He may have thought that it would be a hindrance to the vocation to which God had called him. But he did not fall into the anti-Christian and Manichæan heresy which treated marriage as a necessary evil, or regarded it as an obstacle to priesthood, or placed celibacy above it in intrinsic meritoriousness. On the contrary, more than thirty years ago, in the controversy which arose about the tenure of fellowships, he laid down the true principle that neither matrimony nor celibacy possesses any inherent superiority over the other condition, but that each is best as God indicates His will respecting it to individual men.*

It is impossible to consider the life of Bishop Lightfoot without observing its singular felicity in this respect—that he was one of the few who all his life long seems to have escaped from the stings of malice and detraction. Many public men of the present day, as in all ages, have lived for years amid incessant attacks of which they themselves are often unable to account for the bitterness. In not a few it happens, and has happened, to spend their lives in "the oppression of a perpetual hissing." Take the case of four of the most prominent divines of latter days, Dr. Pusey, Canon Kingsley, Professor Maurice, and Dean Stanley. Their personal experience would have led them to ratify the verdict of the Laureate—

> "Each man walks with his head in a cloud of poisonous flies."

During many years Dr. Pusey passed through hurricanes of abuse. Canon Kingsley, as he tells us in one of his letters, was at more than one period of his career "cursed like a dog" in the public prints, and the chief religious newspaper of the day said of his strong and tender story, "Yeast," that "he taught immorality and insinuated atheism." For long years in succession an article abusing Maurice was the invariable *sauce piquante* which was required in the first number of every evangelical periodical, and reams of insult and slander against him lie rotting in old files of the *Record*. I have seen a paragraph in a High Church paper saying that if (as was probable) a statue was ever raised to the Devil, Dean Stanley would certainly be the fittest person to unveil it; and on his deathbed, as he lay dying, I saw the last number of a very superior Church review speaking with the bitterest contempt of his Christian Institutes—a review which, happily, he was too ill to read, so that he was uninjured by its virulence. Dr. Lightfoot entirely escaped all such literary and theological assaults. The only word of abuse I ever read against him was written opposite to his name in the visitor's-book at the top of Snowdon nearly forty years ago—written probably by some reckless Undergraduate whom he had tried to save from energetic attempts to throw himself away. "When a man's ways please the Lord," says the Book of Proverbs, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." But I do not think that Dr. Lightfoot ever had any enemies. To what was this due? Partly to the sense of his great learning, partly to his uncontroversial way of presenting even controversial truth. He certainly did not suppress his views. His conclusions about the origin and true functions of the ministry are not those which seem to be getting almost universally prevalent among the English clergy. Many of them would not be pleased with his distinct declaration that in the epistles of Ignatius there is to be found no tinge of sacerdotalism. His views on revision—in which his influence told with great power—ran counter to those of Dean Burgon and his numberless adherents. His comments on Col. ii. 20–23, which he explained in a sense directly opposed to the exaltation of asceticism, is only one of many comments in which his opinions were not those of the Ritualists. And yet he somehow escaped antagonism. It is a blessed lot for those by whom it is won legitimately and without compromise. But if any one be led by envy of such spontaneously granted happiness to win it by unhallowed means, by "steering between the Scylla and Charybdis of yes and no," or acquiring a reputation for safety and moderation by "never stating a proposition without carefully protecting himself from seeming to exclude the contradictory," he is not following the great Bishop's example. And whatever be the rare exceptions, Christ's rule holds all but universally true: "Blessed are ye when all men shall hate you, and persecute you, and speak all manner of evil against you falsely for My name's sake;" and "woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you." The rule is normal; but every now and then the Master makes blessed exceptions for those whom He loves.

---

* His words are as follows (on "The Celibacy Question," Oct. 25, 1857):—"When God has not only permitted but sanctioned both states of life alike, is it not unreasonable to hold that *all* the advantages are on the side of the one to the exclusion of the other?"

I have tried, then, to say what little, at the moment, seemed worth saying about the great career, about the noble character, about some of the manifold labours and achievements of a man in whom posterity will probably recognize by far the greatest ecclesiastic of the present day. But his chief eminence and his highest claim upon our gratitude lies in this—that he left us all a stainless example. He sought no honours; though, when they came to him unsought, he accepted them with humility and thankfulness. He was wealthy without ostentation and without avarice. He was a presbyter who rose superior to the temptations of worldliness and ambition. In no man whom I have ever known was there less of egotism or self-seeking, and in this too he resembled the great contemporary poet over whom the grave has so recently closed. Called upon to face death at an age comparatively premature, when years of fruitful work might have lain before him, and when it seemed open to him to win a secure and lasting memorial in the minds of all men, by completing his editions of St. Paul's Epistles, and gratifying his longing to write a history of the fourth century, he rose at the call of God, and left his unfinished work and his accumulated materials, not only without a murmur, but without so much as a sigh of regret or a single backward glance. How can I end more fitly than in his own noble words?—

> "While I was suffering from overwork, and before I understood the true nature of my complaint, it was the strain, both in London and at home, in connection wtih the Pan-Anglican gatherings, that broke me down hopelessly. I did not regret it then, and I do not regret it now. I should not have wished to recall the past even if my illness had been fatal. For what, after all, is the individual life in the history of the Church? Men may come and men may go; individual lives float down like straws on the surface of the waters till they are lost in the ocean of eternity. But the broad, mighty, rolling stream of the Church itself—the cleansing, purifying, fertilizing tide of the river of God—flows on for ever and ever."

DR. VON DÖLLINGER.

From *The Guardian* (London), January 22, 1890.

It is to be hoped that the great man who was taken from us on January 10th may eventually find a worthy biographer in some one of the distinguished Germans who enjoyed his intimacy, such as Professor Reusch, or in our own brilliant countryman Lord Acton. But he has had many friends of a less conspicuous order, even in England; and some of these may be encouraged to place their recollections of him upon record by remembering that every such contribution, however fragmentary, does something to promote that full appreciation of what he was which all must desire who have had the happiness of knowing him.

The present writer first made his acquaintance rather more than thirty years ago, and has constantly visited him since; indeed, with three exceptions, once in every year since 1870. Nor is his experience in this matter peculiar; it would be easy to name others who, like himself, have looked upon the almost yearly journey to Munich as combining the mental advantages of attendance at a lecture, or rather a series of lectures, of the highest value, with the moral advantages of a pilgrimage. It may, perhaps, be allowable to name the late Rev. H. N. Oxenham, for whom Dr. Döllinger had a great personal affection, and who fully enjoyed his confidence, and the Rev. Dr. Plummer, the accomplished Master of University College, Durham, to whom, with Mr. Oxenham, English readers are indebted for admirable translations of several of Dr. Döllinger's works, and who knew him well enough to know that the tenderness and strength of his character were not less interesting than the acuteness of his intellect and the astonishing wealth of his learning.

Such pilgrims, if they may so be described, would go to Munich, or to Tegernsee, for no other purpose than to enjoy the privilege of conversation with Döllinger. Munich, as all the world knows, since King Ludwig I., has been famous for its public collections and for its churches; and Tegernsee is sufficiently close to the foot of the Bavarian Alps to be surrounded by very pretty scenery. But neither the collections nor the scenery were the attractions that drew these pilgrims. It was prudent to write a note beforehand, and propose a visit, so that the coast might be kept clear; and then one took a room at the Bavarian Hotel or in some lodging nearer to the Von der Taun

Strasse, or, if he was staying for his summer holiday in Lord Acton's Villa d'Arco at Tegernsee, at the village "Post." Then, day after day, he insisted on his friend coming to his one o'clock dinner, and this was followed by a walk generally in the English garden at Munich, or at Tegernsee on the hill which rises above the lake, and which he climbed up, even in his ninetieth year, with surprising nimbleness, or round the southern extremity of the lake, or down the road to Gmund. Such walks would last for two or three hours, or sometimes longer, and when they were over he would invite his companion to come in and look at books which had been discussed, or take notes, or continue unfinished conversations until nine or ten o'clock at night. Considering the vast extent of his correspondence and the great literary tasks in which he was incessantly engaged, nothing could be more generous than such a devotion of time and thoughts to strangers, who, in one case at any rate, had little or nothing to give in return, and who never left his rooms without a quickened sense of the vastness of human knowledge, of the value of truth, and of the dignity of all work which is inspired by a high moral purpose.

1. The subjects discussed in these conversations with Dr. Döllinger were of the most various description. Sometimes he would revert to his own early days, and his boyish recollection of his father and the first Napoleon. His strong feelings about the French dated from those years of sorrow and humiliation for Germany. Not that these feelings ever prevented him from doing justice to great Frenchmen, whom he knew well in middle life, such as Montalembert and Lacordaire. At other times he would discuss Möhler, with whom he had been on terms of close intimacy during their association with each other as brother professors at Munich, and whose essays he had himself edited after Möhler's death. "Möhler's greatest work was, of course, his *Symbolik;* but it scarcely made more sensation in Germany than had been before made by his *Einheit in d. Kirche.*" Möhler's Church History, Dr. Döllinger thought, ought never to have been published; it was an injury to his reputation. It was, in fact, published some years after Möhler's death by a Benedictine Father in Munich, who had attended Möhler's lectures and taken copious notes, but who produced a book which is very imperfect, and in places inaccurate. In the same way Reithmayr had published Möhler's notes on the *Epistle to the Romans;* but they were too fragmentary for publication, so Reithmayr had added a great deal of his own. It was impossible now to say what was Möhler's and what was Reithmayr's. Dr. Döllinger thought it a mistake to say, as was often said in England, that Cardinal Newman had derived his theory of development from Möhler. Möhler, he held, did not say much more on this subject than had been said by earlier theologians; Newman had gone much further.

Another German with whom Döllinger had been intimate was the distinguished Orientalist Windischmann. English readers of German theology probably know Windischmann best by his brief commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians; but at one time he was the best Zend scholar in Germany. His father was a professor at Bonn; but he had passed his life at Munich, and had begun as a pupil of Döllinger's. "He was the only person," said Dr. Döllinger, "whom I ever knew who combined the highest qualities of a critical scholar with Ultramontane opinions." He was "an Ultramontane by nature, with a native capacity for organizing and ruling." He was secretary to the first *Arch*bishop of Munich, who was a moderate man, but who suddenly in his old age developed curiously extreme opinions. The fact was, he was in the hands of Windischmann. Then came Cardinal Reisach—an Ultramontane by training. He and Windischmann got on well together; but Windischmann managed the diocese. When Reisach's successor was appointed, the King made it a condition that Windischmann should not be Vicar-General; but the new Archbishop was persuaded to let him have the direction of ecclesiastical studies in the seminary at Freysing. "Ah," said Dr. Döllinger, laughing, "Windischmann once told me that he had satisfied himself that the Bollandist editors of the *Lives of the Saints* had been too critical in rejecting a great many legends! And yet when the *Philosophumena* of St. Hippolytus was discovered, Windischmann, who did not like the book, caught eagerly at a current story that it had been forged by Simonides, although it carried in itself the traces of its genuineness."

The matter of these conversations was often and naturally determined by Dr. Döllinger's literary occupations at the moment; and not unfrequently an entire walk would be devoted to a single subject. On one occasion, when preparing a book that has since been published, he discussed the question "why Cardinal Bellarmine had not been canonized." The Jesuits were anxious for it, and at one time the "process" had gone a great way. There were two difficulties which Döllinger thought proved fatal. One was the strength of Bellarmine's language about the dispensing power of the Pope; Bellarmine had largely devoted his later life to maintaining generally the political ascendency of the Pope in Christendom. His canonization would have involved the Church's approval of this position, and it was impossible to brave all the Governments of Europe. The other difficulty was Bellarmine's egotism, of which there was abundant evidence in his autobiography. This subject led on in another walk to his discussing the theological supremacy of the Spaniards in the Roman Church of the sixteenth century. The Italians were really their pupils. There was no comparison between Bellarmine and Suarez. This theological supremacy of Spain was not unconnected with her remarkable predominance in the councils of the Vatican until a new policy was inaugurated by Urban VIII. In another walk, not two years before his death, he talked about Harnack and other modern Germans. His companion had been recently studying Wellhausen's *Prolegomena,* and was anxious for his judgment on some of its more startling positions. "To tell you the truth," he said, "I began to read it because I had heard that a great deal was thought of it in the Protestant Universities of Germany. But when I had read about eighty or ninety pages I found that I had encountered so many assumptions which required careful proof that I could get no further. So I put it down, and have not since looked at it."

More than once he discussed at length the origin of German Rationalism. He thought that undue stress was often laid, as by Hagenbach, on the influence of the English Deists. Reaction from the unspiritual Lutheran "orthodoxy" and the influence of such writers as Gottfried Arnold had had something to do with it, and Pietism had acted as a solvent upon the old Protestant "orthodoxy." But the first real pioneer of German Rationalism was Töllner's book *Die thätige Gehorsam Christi* (1768). This showed that the extension by the Lutheran divines of their peculiar theory of an imputed righteousness from the passive to the active obedience of Christ had, when translated into the popular rendering—"Everything has been done for me; and for me to do anything is superfluous or worse"—challenged a moral opposition which became in the event doctrinal. The subject is too vast to be pursued; but the suggestion is particularly instructive.

In these conversations Döllinger's intense German feeling was often more conspicuous than the literary reserve of his books would permit. This appeared especially in his feeling about Luther. For Luther's "imputation doctrine," as he called it, he had, as already implied, no sympathy; it often led to lax morality, and it misrepresented St. Paul. He would contrast Luther on the Galatians with Bishop Bull in the *Harmonia Apostolica*, not to the advantage of the former. "After all," he said, "good Lutherans are always better than their theory; none of them would say that a man who has no love of God in his heart will live with Him forever only because he believes on Him." He was under no temptation to apologize for Luther when describing an Apostolic Epistle which condemned his own theory as "an Epistle of straw," or allowing a religious partisan to have two wives at once, or throwing to the winds the Episcopate which he had at one time no difficulty whatever in retaining. But, especially in his later life, Döllinger felt deeply the immense evils of which Tetzel was an embodiment, and the enormous courage of Luther's early resistance to them. He was proud of Luther as a very brave man, if not as a theologian. This German feeling extended into all departments of national life. He was passionately German in his appreciation of the events of 1870–71. Yet he was not thereby rendered incapable of justice. In a conversation on the prospects of religion in Europe he suddenly asked the question, "Which do you suppose to be the most ungodly city in Europe?" His companion answered, "Paris," supposing the answer to be true and withal agreeable to the feelings of his questioner. "No," he said after a pause, "it is not Paris." "Which then?" "Well, since you press me—I am *Germanissimus Germanorum,* but—I am sorry to say I believe it to be Berlin; in no other capital is God so forgotten by so large a proportion of the population." Then he proceeded at some length to give the statistics on which this opinion was based, and he accounted for the fact as a natural result of the long prevalence of Rationalism.

The academical temper, which Döllinger possessed in a high degree, would often appear to discourage or even regard with a sort of contempt any pastoral or devotional interests; and this is not always confined to cases where it may be explained as a result of unbelief. Nothing could be less true of Dr. Döllinger. He would discuss a devotional manual, or a sermon, or a missionary or philanthropic enterprise as sympathetically as the newest effort of critical scholarship; and he was keenly alive to everything that bore upon the moral, as distinct from the intellectual, well-being of the people. As an example, he deplored the modern passion for Wagner's music; parts of it, he thought, were productive of distinctly immoral results. When his companion expressed wonder that any music could have results of this kind, "Ah," he said, "I see you do not understand me; we Germans take music in earnest."

2. It was inevitable that Döllinger should feel keen interest in the Oxford movement. He had read Pusey's *Theology in Germany* with great interest at the time of its appearance, but that work gave no promise of the direction which its author's mind would take, although it afforded evidence of qualities which would make any career remarkable. But the *Tracts for the Times* had not long been published before attention was drawn to them in the Protestant press of Germany, and, as time went on, with less and less sympathy. It could not of course be otherwise; in spite of Pusey's hopes of what might be achieved by Tholuck and other believing and learned Protestants, the general drift of German Protestantism was steadily tending toward advanced unbelief; and as a matter of course, the Tractarian assertions of the authoritative claims of Christian antiquity, of the necessity of the Episcopate to the organization of the Church of God, and of the awful doctrines of grace whether in the operation of our Lord through Sacraments, or in the soul, could not be welcome to it. It was from the Protestant press of Germany that Döllinger, still devoted to the Roman Church, learnt to appreciate within certain limits the Oxford movement. In 1842, Pusey had written to him about the collation of some patristic MSS., and in his reply Döllinger observed:

> "In Germany, all eyes, of Protestants as well as of Roman Catholics, are turned in fear and hope towards Oxford; it becomes more and more probable that your great and memorable movement will have serious influence on the course of religious development in Germany."

Then he proceeds:

> "I have read almost all your works, most particularly also your letter to the Bishop of Oxford and what you have written about Tract XC.; and though some passages were painful to me or seemed to me erroneous, there is *far more* in them with which I can entirely agree, nay, much which seemed to me to have been written out of my own soul. With the greatest interest I read—I even devour—the numbers of the *British Critic* as soon as they arrive here, also the works of Newman and the excellent book by Faber, *Sights and Thoughts*, etc. From all these writings I retain such an impression that I feel almost inclined to call out, *Tales cum sitis, iam nostri estis*, or, if you like it better thus, *Tales cum sitis, iam vestri sumus!* Everything with us in Germany also points more and more distinctly towards a great religious *consummatio*, towards a drawing together of kindred elements, and of those which belong to each other, and of a separation [of elements unnaturally joined] which will proceed in the same ratio. Once more, and now probably for the last time, the attempt is being made in Germany to assert again the old Protestantism of the Symbolical Books; but the union established by Prussia has dealt it a deep wound, and on the other side the corrosive poison of Hegel's Pantheism, in union with the destructive criticism of the Bible, is spreading incessantly. Even the Protestant theological faculty at Tübingen, formerly the chief support of the still positive-Christian theology in Protestant Germany, is now almost completely in the hands of Hegel's party."

In a later part of the same letter Dr. Döllinger adds:

> "May I now ask you to express to Mr. Newman in my name the especial respect which his writings have led me to entertain for him?"

The secession of Mr. Newman to the Church of Rome in October, 1845, was not the issue for the movement which Döllinger had anticipated, although at the time, as a good Roman Catholic, he could not but rejoice at it. He does not appear to have communicated much with Pusey again until 1866, when the Rev. H. N. Oxenham, who had also become a Roman Catholic, but had not repudiated his old affection for and intercourse with Pusey, was largely the means of renewing it. Döllinger was delighted with Pusey's *Eirenicon.* "I am convinced," he wrote in May, 1866, "by reading your *Eirenicon* that we are united inwardly in our religious convictions, although externally we belong to two separated Churches." He furnished Pusey with details about the opinions and dispositions of the prelates who then occupied several German sees, as Pusey contemplated a visit to Germany, such as he actually made to France, in order to bring the question of the reunion of the separated branches of the Church under the notice of the Continental Episcopate.

After the Vatican Council Döllinger looked upon the English secessions to Rome of 1845 and 1851 as errors, many of which would not have been committed if the Decree of Infallibility could have been foreseen. He also thought that it was a misfortune of the Oxford movement that the patristic period of Church history had been studied to the neglect of the mediæval:

> "No one probably," he once said, "now living knows so much of the fourth century as does Car-

dinal Newman. I wish he had known as much of the tenth or the fourteenth. No one," he continued, "can study the documents which describe the manner of the suppression of the Templars and continue to think of the mediæval Papacy as a throne of justice in the midst of Christendom—the friend of righteous weakness, the foe of unjust tyranny. Clement V. was the tool—too probably the conscious tool—of the French king, in a transaction as dark as you can find, in the annals of the Church of Christ."

With Pusey Döllinger maintained warm friendship to the day of Pusey's death. Each sent the other his books; and communications were as frequent between them as was possible for two such busy people. They did not always agree. Döllinger thought some of Pusey's positions in his Lectures on Daniel difficult to maintain; and he did not hesitate to express his disappointment at portions of Pusey's Letter on the Double Procession. But they had too much in common to regard each other with other feelings than those of deep affection and respect; and no man could have mourned Pusey's death in 1882 more sincerely than Döllinger.

3. Döllinger had become more or less dissatisfied with the course which things were taking in the Roman Catholic Church some years before the Vatican Council. His dislike of the Encyclical was well known; and he expressed opinions unfavorable to the maintenance of the Temporal Power. Again, he felt strongly that "the Church was disgraced" when Peter d'Arbues was canonized in 1868; regarding it as "a canonization of the Spanish Inquisition." He wrote some articles against it in the *Allgemeine Zeitung,* and he believed that the authorship was guessed at the time. The affair caused much strong feeling in Germany; no attention was paid to it in England. He thought it possible that "a well-written article in the *Times* might have commanded sufficient attention to stop the 'process.'" This opinion, perhaps, may be questioned; but there can be no doubt that the measure was not without influence on one mind which it was imprudent to alienate. When the Vatican Council defined the doctrine of Papal infallibility, and Dr. Döllinger was desired to accept it, he could not but refuse obedience. To have done otherwise would have been "to part with the sense of truth." The case of Honorius alone, he once said, should have made the definition impossible. In every way open to him, he opposed "the threatened disaster;" he hoped that it was impossible; but at last it came. He took his line after a mental anguish of which those who had the privilege of knowing him could not but be aware. He knew too well how many and how formidable are the forces which are ranged in our day against the Christian Revelation to be willing to add, with a light heart, by an act of his own, to the existing divisions of Christendom. He was far removed from the boisterous assertion of self which is observable in Luther. He "could not assent to what he knew to be false;" but his attitude was passive, not active. Rome forced him to dissent from her by bidding him accept a novel doctrine as a term of communion; but he did not add to the refusal of submission the proclamation of a fierce anti-Roman crusade. The Old Catholic organization sprang from the necessity of providing means of grace for those who were excluded by the new dogma from the Roman fold; but Döllinger hoped, at any rate at first, that his action and that of others might lead the authorities of the Church of Rome to reconsider and, so far as they could, to retrace a false step. This hope of his has not yet seemed likely to be realized, and the Old Catholics have, from the necessity of the case, gone forward in the work of providing themselves with a duly consecrated Episcopate, and other conditions of an assured communion with our Lord.

The strength of Döllinger's attitude at the time and since is, in the good sense of that much-abused word, its moderation. In this he offers a contrast not only to some names on this side of the Channel which will occur to readers of the *Guardian,* but especially to the great and brilliant but paradoxical thinker who wrote the *Paroles d'un Croyant.* Because Döllinger could not accept the infallibility of all the Popes, and was led to see that the authority which could propose it was not what he had hitherto believed it to be, he did not proceed to break with all authority. For him unbelief—not Rome—was still the great opponent; and his principal reason for deploring the Vatican Decree of Papal infallibility was the impetus which it gave to unbelief in educated Germany. Persons representing various phases of negative thought took it for granted that they would find sympathy in the most powerful mind with which Rome had quarrelled in the present century. They were some of them even rudely disappointed. They could not understand Döllinger. Either "he ought not to have revolted at all, or he ought to have carried his revolt to its logical conclusions"—conclusions which, it is needless to add, differed very widely according to the standpoint of his various critics. He was perfectly courtcous to everybody, but he kept his theological and historical conscience intact. It is little to say that he paid no compliments to the purely destructive criticism which is the child of German Protestantism. He insisted upon the necessity of the Episcopate to the organization of the Church of Christ. This, of course, limited, if it did not altogether forfeit, the sympathies of all non-episcopal Christian communities. But he was equally honest with those who more nearly shared his own convictions. He could not allow members of the Church of England who were admitted to his intimacy to think that she was, even in theory, an exact reproduction of the primitive Church. And when the Old Catholics permitted their clergy to marry, he made no secret of his disapproval. There were many examples in the primitive Church of married men who had been ordained and had retained their wives, although he did not know of any instance of the marriage of an ordained man. But his deepest objection was of a practical character. A body like the Old Catholic clergy could only hope to succeed if the world believed in their disinterestedness; and to this belief such an eagerness to throw off restraints on natural inclination would, he thought, be well-nigh fatal. He mentioned cases in which the measure had already led to a return to the Roman Church.

An able writer in the *Spectator* observes that:

> "His habit of deference to the Church's authority in concrete detail was more deeply rooted than his habit of deference to the Church's larger and vaguer authority when asking submission to her definitive decrees. When she said to him, 'Don't celebrate mass any more,' he seems to have regarded himself more bound to obey her than when she said to him, 'Believe what I tell you'" (*Spectator*, Jan. 18, 1890).

Waiving the question of fact as to saying mass, this is, taken generally, a fair account of Döllinger's attitude. But surely it is sufficiently intelligible by reference to his sense of truth. His moral nature was not challenged when authority desired him to desist from particular clerical duties, but it was challenged when he was desired to profess public assent to a doctrine which he knew to be irreconcilable with facts. If no Popes had lived, it might have been more possible to define by anticipation that all Popes would be infallible. But the Papacy had given many pledges to history, and no authority could make a long series of Popes to be simultaneously infallible when it was notorious that some of them had contradicted others. Döllinger would have said: "I am sorry that you desire me not to say the Church service; yet I have no moral difficulty in obeying you. But I cannot obey you if you tell me to profess before the world that two and two make five; and the doctrine of Papal infallibility appears to me to involve an assertion of this order."

Döllinger's anxiety to strengthen the cause of faith in positive truth had more than any other motive to do with his promotion of the movement which issued in the two conferences at Bonn in 1874 and 1875. It is unnecessary to describe proceedings which have long since been public property; but none of those who were present can forget the scene in which Döllinger's intellectual and moral superiority was so strikingly exhibited. Surrounded as he was by Eastern and English Bishops, and by more or less learned men from various parts of Europe, his judgment on a variety of questions was scarcely challenged, even in committees which were appointed for the purpose of free discussion. Perhaps the mind which in learning and acuteness most nearly approached his own was that of Professor Ossinin, of St. Petersburg. Looking back in 1884 on these efforts, he said that he "did not himself expect to see any visible results of them. Nothing could be done in the way of reunion with Rome while her system was unchanged. The best prospects for a reunited Christendom now lay in the direction of the East." After the conferences he had written to Professor Ossinin begging him to ascertain whether the Eastern Bishops would accept the proposals of 1875 as a basis of negotiation. He supposed that the Eastern Bishops were still corresponding with each other; but no formal reply had been given. The question of the Seventh Council and the icons would be a difficulty, as the Easterns held the use of icons to be a matter not of discipline, but of dogma. Nothing solid could be done until the Easterns, after more intimate religious contact with the West, would consent to regard that question as one of discipline respecting which Churches might lawfully differ from each other. But that reunion would come in time, he had no doubt; it would be forced on Christians by the foes of Christianity. "At the age of eighty-five," he said, "I cannot hope to see it; you may possibly do so."

Not the least beautiful feature of Dr. Döllinger's character was the entire absence of bitter or selfish feelings. The Bavarian sees were at one time almost all filled by his pupils; and of these some even joined in condemning him. "They probably could not help it," he said; "they were in a very difficult position." Perhaps he felt the submission of Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, to the Vatican decrees more than that of any one else. "Hefele's learning," he said, "might have kept him straight, but his position was, we must recollect, particularly embarrassing." Somebody mentioned Hergenröther's answer to Janus. "He is a learned man," said Döllinger, "and I am glad to think" (here he smiled archly) "that I have been the means, however indirectly, of making him a Cardinal." That he himself had not been promoted before 1870 would not have occurred to him; one cannot imagine his referring to anything of the kind complainingly. On two occasions when walking with him in the English Garden, the present writer witnessed his meeting with two successive Archbishops of Munich. In either case almost exactly the same scene took place. "Here comes the Archbishop," said Dr. Döllinger, interrupting a conversation. The Archbishop was accompanied by two chaplains, who fell back as Dr. Döllinger approached, while Dr. Döllinger's companion also retreated in an opposite direction. On both occasions the meeting seemed to be marked by every expression of cordiality. On rejoining Dr. Döllinger, it was impossible to avoid observing to him that, for an excommunicated person, he had been received very honourably. "They are very kind to me," he said; "I wish that truth left me at liberty to respond to their advances as they desire." Indeed, the clergy of Munich generally appeared to share the same feeling as the Archbishops; and when Döllinger walked through the streets of Munich every priest and seminarist whom he met hastened to raise his hat, while the poor children, with whom he had an especial reputation for kindness, rushed forward to kiss his hand and receive his blessing. While listening to his conversation and witnessing these scenes it was perhaps allowable for a looker-on to ask himself what kind of character would have enriched human experience, if the Apostle of inspired dialectics had for a while blended in a single personality with the Apostle of Divine love. H. P. L.

GUTHRIE'S POWER IN PREACHING.

A Reminiscence.

BY REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER, D.D.

From *The New York Observer*, (Presbyterian), Jan. 25, 1890.

To-day we heard Dr. Guthrie on Eli's submission to God's will. "It is the Lord; let him do what seemeth him good." One of Dr. Guthrie's peculiarities of originality and power is the depth of feeling and faith with which he carries the gospel into the Old Testament narratives and laws, and sees the path of experience that has been passed over by the Hebrews for our instruction, in the "stern lights" flung back by Christ and his apostles. It was a most graphic and striking sermon, in which sweet and instructive spiritual truths were illustrated by very graphic imagery, and dramatic power of description. He might have taken his text from Job's heart-searching and appealing question, "What? Shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil? The Lord gave; the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord!"

But Eli's faults and failures of character were behind the text. And the preacher finely described the native desert of evil, and the effect of its consciousness, in the humbled and penitent soul; the patience and forbearance of God with our accumulated guilt and sin; his goodness and mercy in treating us with such kindness, and granting us such a reprieve from everlasting woe. And then in contrast he showed the wickedness of a repining disposition, especially considering the nature of the new law, under which the Christian, since his great respite, is living; of God's gracious discipline for his eternal good. "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten. Be zealous therefore and repent. Behold I stand at the door and knock." God in Christ stands at the door, even of unfaithful ungrateful ones, and of those who have left their first love, and become lukewarm, and yet imagine themselves rich, and do not know that they are wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked.

And if any such man (says the Lord Jesus) hear my voice, and open the door, even after so long a time, and so wide a course of departure from me, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me. So did God with Eli, so did God with David, so with Peter, so with us all. And all this compassion and mercy and pardoning love, so exhaustless, through the new covenant in Christ's blood, all the purchase of Christ's atoning propitiatory sacrifice! For he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world. Who can rightly measure or describe the greatness of such mercy? Who this side the realization of that eternal death, which is the consequence of sin unrepented of, unforgiven? "Hast thou entered into the springs of that sea? or hast thou walked in the search of those depths? Have the gates of death been opened unto thee, or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?"

He described a criminal sentenced to be hanged, but pardoned for the sake of some one high in rank and power, who had chosen and consented to suffer in his stead, taking the penalty upon himself, that the criminal might be spared. He supposed the case of the reprieve granted, with the condition of the criminal being remanded to his prison and kept there for a few weeks under tuition, in preparation for a very high station of honor, usefulness and power, for which it was necessary to prepare him. "Now, suppose," said he, "the criminal is on the scaffold, the cap is drawn over his head, he stands on the trap-door over the gulf, the hangman's hand is on the bolt to strike it out and let the wretched victim drop into eternity, only awaiting the signal of the waving of the handkerchief, when, suddenly, a horseman is seen and heard shouting in the distance; the lane is formed, he gallops forward, bloody with spurring, fiery red with haste, and in the moment of despair, reads the king's offer of mercy!"

Ah, what shall the life be, thenceforward, so saved? "Into thy hands I commit my spirit! Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth. For great is thy mercy toward me, and thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell. Thou hast delivered my soul from death; and now I will walk before the Lord, in the land of the living. I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto the Lord, now, in the presence of all the people. My mouth shall show forth thy righteousness and thy salvation, all the day."

What less can the sinner, so redeemed, do for his Saviour? What, when endless life is given to him, and a place of blessedness and glory in the likeness of his Redeemer, instead of the endurance of the penalty of all his transgressions in that eternal death which he was about to suffer.

I have said that Eli's sins were behind the text. And so is the reality of a never-ending wrath to come, and a belief in it from conviction of the conscience and the heart, at God's Word, behind every invitation and assurance of divine mercy; behind the cross and the sufferings of Christ, which would be inexplicable, but for the eternal reason for them, and unnecessary were there no such thing under the government of God as an eternal retribution. The power of Dr. Guthrie's preaching of Christ's redeeming love is grounded in the truth of an eternal destiny of misery in the sinner's own character, unrespited, unbelieving, unforgiven! "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men."

How are we all, if we have not fled for refuge to the hope set before us in Christ, and offered by his dying love, hanging on the verge of trembling hope between that region of despair and this of the persuasive urgency of mercy!

"A point of time, a moment's space,
Removes us to that heavenly place
Or shuts us up in hell."

Yet how insensible! With what careless indifference are these gospel tidings of mercy and warnings of compassion heard every Sabbath day by thousands, who return through all the week to their lives of vanity, ingratitude and sin, just as heedless as though not so much were depending as even the results of an April shower. But when the light of life is waning, and God comes down in the cool of the day, and makes the soul tremble at the voice of the Judge, then we pray for a little longer respite, and if the respite comes, will you use it, oh immortal spirit, travelling to eternity for the gaining of your peace in Christ with God?

Dr. Guthrie, with great power and tenderness, set forth the nature of our reprieve for Jesus' sake, and the infinite obligation of gratitude and love we are under to him.

This was the truth of God, not weakened or darkened, or its force at all abated by any hypodermic injection of eternal hope beyond the grave, when the gospel of Christ plainly informs us there can be no more sacrifice for sin, no new offer of salvation. Which was the kindest and most faithful preaching? Dr. Guthrie's earnestness and plainness, or Canon Farrar's delusion of eternal hope? Which the most likely to save the soul?

Christ's own warning is the best, the surest, the most merciful. "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

REFORMS IN FUNERALS.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE ON CONDUCTING THE SERVICES.

From *The Central Presbyterian* (Richmond, Va.), Jan. 29. 1890.

At the late meeting of the Richmond branch of the Evangelical Alliance, composed of ministers, officers and members of the Protestant churches of the city, held in the rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association, the subject of reforms in funerals was discussed. A committee was appointed to draft a paper relating to some changes proposed in the mode of conducting funerals. The committee consists of Rev. Drs. Newton, Moser, Hatcher and Cutler, with Rev. Dr. Hoge as the chairman, and the report adopted is as follows :

1. As to the Proper Time for Holding Funeral Services.—No fixed rule can determine the proper day of the week for such solemnities. This must be regulated by circumstances over which those most interested often have no control. But whenever practicable it is desirable that they should be held on some other day than the Sabbath, for reasons so obvious that they need not be specified.

2. Funeral Sermons and Addresses.—Here, again, no peremptory rule can be adopted. Different churches have their own traditions, sentiments and customs in this respect. There are occasions when the emotion of sorrow is so profound and universal in the community as to demand the relief which comes from some expression of it, as when a distinguished Christian soldier, statesman or philanthropist is taken away, and when the great lessons of the life of the departed, by common consent, may be enforced in the pulpit. But it is safe to say that the cultivated moral sense of the community is less and less in sympathy with funeral discourses.

The Psalms and portions of Scripture which are ordinarily read or sung on such occasions, expressive of the shortness and uncertainty of life, cannot be made more impressive by any words of man, and the sublime lessons in the 15th chapter of First Corinthians on the resurrection and the life immortal need not be supplemented by any human presentations of the theme.

3. The Expensiveness of Funerals.—Here all will probably agree that reforms are possible, practicable and desirable. We live at a time when the difficulty of obtaining employment is increasing, with the increase of population and of monopolies, which make the rich richer and the poor poorer. A large proportion of the people are in straitened circumstances. A man may ordinarily regulate his household expenses according to his means of living, but he finds his privilege taken away when a death occurs in the family, because of the prevailing custom, which demands such costly preparations for the funeral. Many a family is straitened for months after the funeral for the means of supporting the living, because of the amount expended in burying the dead.

This could be best corrected if the rich would set the example of as much economy in funeral expenses as is consistent with the respect and love they cherish for the departed, and it is not beyond the province of the pulpit to urge a diminution of extravagant display at a time which speaks so impressively of the emptiness and vanity of all that is seen and temporal.

4. Covering the Face of the Dead.—The coffin which encloses the remains of the deceased should be closed before the assembling of the company which gathers at the funeral service. The last look and the leave-taking should be in private, and the friends in attendance should not be subjected to the pain of witnessing the scenes which so often occur at these sad farewells.

Natural sensitiveness on the part of the bereaved and proper regard for the feelings of spectators would seem to suggest the propriety of veiling from public observation all that passes at a moment so delicately personal and sacred.

5. Exposure at the Grave.—Since funerals must occur at all seasons of the year, and often when the weather is most inclement, the question arises, how can dangerous exposure be best avoided.

To stand with uncovered head for a quarter or half an hour on the wet ground, possibly amid rain and sleet and bitter wind, subjects the officiating clergyman and friends of the deceased to unnecessary discomfort and danger.

Some are now sleeping in our cemeteries who would, in all probability, still be among the living but for such disregard of the natural laws of life. It may be suggested, therefore, that after the religious services are concluded, when the weather is inclement, the company may retire, only those remaining whose duty and desire it is to see the interment properly conducted ; that the ladies remain in their carriages, and that none will be expected to stand with uncovered heads in wintry storms after the prayers are ended, nor even during the prayers if age or infirmity of any kind makes such exposure hazardous.

These are some of the suggestions which your committee make, with great respect and deference for the customs, preferences and opinions of others.

Your committee has no authority to commit the alliance to any of the changes proposed. The subject is a difficult and delicate one, and everything like dictation is inadmissible. Only by conference, by mutual agreement, by harmony of feeling and action can reforms in funerals be accomplished.

Moses D. Hoge,
Chairman.

AN INTERVIEW WITH MR. GLADSTONE.

From *The New York Observer* (Presbyterian), Jan. 30, 1890.

Dr. Talmage, of Brooklyn, on Friday, took luncheon and spent the afternoon with Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden Castle. Mr. Gladstone had telegraphed him on Thursday: "Pray come to Hawarden to-morrow." Dr. Talmage was received very cordially by the ex-Premier, and the two gentlemen had a long talk on religious and political questions. Mr. Gladstone said: "Talk about questions of the day; there is but one question, and that is the gospel. It can and will correct everything needing correction. All men at the head of great movements are Christian men. During the many years I was in the Cabinet, I was brought into association with sixty master minds, and all but five of them were Christians. My only hope for the world is in bringing the human mind into contact with divine revelation." Then, placing his hand on Dr. Talmage's shoulder, Mr. Gladstone warmly eulogized the doctor's Christian zeal, and expressed his great gratification at the marvellous publicity given to his sermons, which are now distributed in many lands and read in many languages. After luncheon the two men linked arms and took a walk over Mr. Gladstone's vast estate, its proprietor commenting lovingly on his wonderful trees, as though they were human beings. He then inquired eagerly if Americans paid proper attention to tree culture. Dr. Talmage asked Mr. Gladstone if the cause of Irish Home Rule would be victorious. Mr. Gladstone brightened up and responded emphatically: "Yes; when next election comes." He continued: "It seems to be a dispensation of God that I should be engaged in battle. At my time of life I should be resting. I never had any option in these matters. I dislike contest, but when Ireland, once the refuge of persecuted Englishmen, showed herself ready to adopt a righteous constitution and do her full duty, I hesitated not a moment to espouse her cause." Concerning America, he said: "No one outside of the United States is bound to love it more than I am." Pointing to numerous beautiful gifts from America, he went on to say: "Everywhere I have practical impression of the tender thoughtfulness and kindness of the American people." Toward evening, when bidding Dr. Talmage farewell, Mr. Gladstone pressed into his hands some books and pamphlets containing autographic inscriptions, and also a copy of his own Latin rendering of his favorite hymn, "Rock of Ages," and said: "Give my highest regards to President Harrison, and express to Mr. Blaine my deepest sympathy with him on account of the loss of his beloved son."

FINDING A FIELD.

From *The Presbyterian Journal* (Philadelphia), Jan. 30, 1890.

Every servant of God has somewhere his appointed field of labor. God has no servants who have no posts of service with their attendant duties. There is a personal sphere of service for every one who has a name and place in his spiritual household. This sphere is not the same for all, nor even for any two of his servants, in the infinite diversity of the functions of the divine economy. But every one is given his own field of certain assignable limits, which is his own province and not another's, and for which he is personally responsible and accountable to the Master.

There may be temporary perplexity in ascertaining the field to which Providence is calling one who seems to be holding a blank commission. But there cannot be long any real difficulty in determining clearly just what this way may be in given instances, for the sure way of ascertaining it is to begin at once with the service nearest at hand. Duty done is the door of opportunity for further and larger service. One finds his field and is guided to it by his going out into it. He discovers his calling to it by his actually entering it and endeavoring to compass its bounds. The successful worker who has all the work he can do and more is not he who idly waits for it but who goes forth to find it. So soon as the gate of opportunity is open only wide enough to admit him in any wise he enters in and does with his might what his hands find to do. In this way he is not long in ascertaining his proper and personal field of labor. His gifts, his culture, his experience, his aptitudes, the pressure of circumstances, the leadings of Providence guide him unerringly to his work.

This field of labor may not be indeed the one he chose for himself. It may be very unlike the one he would prefer if he might choose. Perhaps in the vast majority of instances, the sovereign voice of the Master crosses the personal desires and aspirations of his servants. But every true follower of the Lord bows implicitly to the divine behests and learns by faithful labor to make the divine choice his own. He might desire a larger field or a smaller one, a more easy or a more difficult one, a more humble or a more conspicuous one ; but every rising of desire is silenced and hushed in the remembrance that the Master determines it for him, and that therefore he is in the right place.

This is not to say, however, that the true servant of Christ is content to excuse himself with only the ordinary rounds of service. He adopts the Master's service as his own and is satisfied only as he sees it going forward. Whatever he can do and all he can do is his constant aim and endeavor. He is full of venture and enterprise in making proof of his calling, is ever ready to try untried means and to explore new fields for the Master, as well as new methods in old ones. He is positive, hopeful, aggressive, laborious, believing. Such is the spirit of the ideal servant of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Such a laborer can never fail of a great reward. It may not come at once, or even soon, but come it will and without fail in the final award of the Master. Years of faithful toil in obscure and unfruitful fields are often the indispensable discipline to higher and more influential stations. To all such as fit themselves for it by wise, faithful, laborious preparation, the Lord at last swings wide the portals of opportunity and bids them enter on their reward. For the true reward for service rendered is ampler privilege for further service. Fitness and fidelity are the sure precursors of the plaudit of the Master : "Well done, good and faithful servant ; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things ; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

CHRISTIAN UNION.

From *The Western Recorder* (Baptist), Louisville, Ky., Feb. 6, 1890.

A GOOD deal has been said about the union of all the denominations, and a good many plans have been suggested. We have never been of those who thought it well to have different denominations, although free variety is much better than enforced uniformity. There was but one denomination in the time of the Apostles, and will be but one in the millennium. Usually, as in the case of Alexander Campbell, the man who seeks to unite all the denominations, succeeds only in making one more, and so complicating the problem.

Now that the question is up rather more formally than before, it were well to see what practical results can be reached. Taking the Bible as God's Word, we are bound to believe that the differences of belief among Christians are because some or all of them believe differently from what the Bible teaches. If all would conform their belief to Scripture all differences would vanish. It is obvious, therefore, that the way to get together is to study the Bible afresh to learn just what it teachings are on the disputed points. Just so far as this teaching can be received will Christians be brought together.

The compromise idea is vain. The Word of God will not shift as men give and take. One man must not be required to give up what is true, because somebody else has given up what is false. Union can never be reached by mutual concession so long as men retain faith in the Bible.

But since we all accept the Bible as God's Word, none can reasonably object to making its teaching the basis of union. Then let representative men and competent scholars of the different denominations be selected, who will meet and consider the differences of belief from the Bible standpoint. Let them see if they can agree as to what the Bible says on church polity, on the act and subjects of baptism, on the conditions of salvation, on the meaning and use of the ordinances, etc. These are questions that ought to be settled and might be settled if there were an honest effort to conform to Bible teaching.

Even though this proposed conference should not be able to agree on all points, it is morally certain they would agree in some things, and that the field would be cleared of much useless and cumbersome rubbish. Afterward subsequent conferences could be held, and finally union could be secured, a union on the Bible, which is the only union possible or worth having. In the dark ages there was practical union, the dissenters being few and obscure, but that union was not on the Bible. Rather it made bonfires of Bibles. That sort of union can never be repeated and the only possible one left must rest on Scripture.

If, now, the Episcopalian Convention and others who are urging Christian union are in earnest, let them go at it in the way suggested. The idea of uniting under "the historic episcopate" is grotesquely absurd.

That was the sort of union they had in the dark ages. Only the Bible episcopate, along with Bible other things can be received.

We should be heartily glad to see such a conference held. It could certainly do no harm, and if no visible result was reached, the way would be prepared for future effective work along the same line.

WHAT DO WE GO TO CHURCH FOR ?

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, Feb. 6, 1890.

We hear a great deal nowadays about diminished attendance at church. As a matter of fact we suspect that there is in most communities as large a proportion of church-goers as in the more devout past times with which such damaging comparisons are often made. However that may be, one thing is true : we do find a tendency in this day to think of churches as a sort of Sunday lyceums. We are a good deal in the habit of going to church with the object of being entertained by the preacher.

The power of the pulpit is rightly held in high esteem among Protestants. Do we as fully recognize the element of worship in our church services ? The revised version has taught us that the "tabernacle of the congregation" was properly the "tent of meeting," *i.e.*, an appointed place for men to meet God. It is in that sense we should use the good old name "meeting-house." It is in that way we should use the place. Great as may be the profit and stimulus to be got from preaching, we do not get all, nor the best, that church services are designed to give, unless there is a real coming before God in thought, in song, in prayer. An assemblage of worshippers in a house of worship is a means for doing this with which few people can dispense. Of this worship preaching should be a true part, fitting into and filling out the rest. It is for this worship that we should go to church.

There is constant need of emphasizing this truth, especially in the non-liturgical churches. Indifference to it is what makes so many persons careless about punctuality at church. They don't mind missing what are often called, with unconscious irony, the "preliminary" services. We once knew a young man who made a point of not going to church until it was time for the sermon to begin. He was a busy student and wanted, as he said, to save time ! How often, too, we see people listless and distraught during the service of worship, and only becoming alert when the preacher gives out his text. As a natural result, even the preaching does not accomplish what it ought. There are few sermons sincerely spoken in which a listener who has been reverently worshipping God cannot find profit. But one who listens as he would to a lecture or a play will often miss what is best in the best of sermons.

Perhaps the neglect of the worship idea may account, in part at least, for the difficulty of filling our Protestant churches. The Romanists gather great congregations at all hours and in all weather. It is not by offering pulpit attractions, but by pressing the obligation of worship. We may sneer at it as superstition. A slight infusion of the same sentiment would be wholesome for many Protestant Christians. Church vagrancy is a legitimate outcome of the Sunday lyceum view. Those who seek little beyond entertainment in going to church will go where they can get the most of it, and will always be drawn by a fresh attraction. A good deal of our modern church architecture is carefully adapted to foster this tendency. We have "auditories" nowadays, and congregations often appropriately figure as "audiences." We cannot too seriously remind ourselves that we ought to go to church, first, last, and always, to worship God, and that everything about the place and the service should help us to do that.

CURRENT FLINGS AT THE OLD TESTAMENT.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, Jan. 16, 1890.

Nothing is more common than remarks depreciatory of the Old Testament, and, being so common, they often find their way into print. Even religious newspapers do not escape the infection, and hardly a week passes that our eye does not fall upon utterances, by editor or contributor, sometimes mildly and indirectly depreciating the Old Testament by exalting the New, sometimes roundly asserting that the Old Testament is a worthless or even dangerous study for Christians. Thus one esteemed contemporary lately remarked : "Why send their children for their morals to Solomon, who was king of a harem, and who was not temperate in life—whose Proverbs can be cited to please the wine-drinker as well as the abstainer—and all this with the New Testament open before you ?"

It is greatly to be regretted that this wiser than Solomon was not consulted in the making of the Book of Proverbs, so that we might have had something that he could conscientiously circulate as an orthodox total abstinence and prohibition tract. The conduct of our Lord doubtless fails to commend itself to this stern moralist, inasmuch as "the Son of Man came eating and drinking," thus giving his enemies the opportunity to slander him as "a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber." The self-sufficiency of such criticism reminds one of the Spanish philosopher who regretted his absence when the world was created, as he could undoubtedly have given the Almighty several valuable hints.

But seriously now, do not those who indulge in remarks of this nature perceive the assumption on which they are founded, namely, that the Holy Spirit made a sad mistake when he inspired the Hebrew writers to produce the Old Testament? The idea, stated so baldly, seems hardly separable from blasphemy. The remarkable thing, moreover, about the flings proceeding from this unconscious assumption is that the critics nearly all profess a belief in the Bible—the whole Bible—as given by inspiration of God, a revelation of the divine nature and purposes. We have charitably called this assumption an unconscious one, for it is not to be supposed that sincere Christians would deliberately charge a blunder upon God. One must suppose that they have been perplexed by imperfections in the Old Testament, as compared with the New, and have failed to grasp the idea of a progressive revelation, suited in each stage to the mental and moral development of the race. It was not until the fulness of the times had come that the complete revelation of God in Jesus Christ could be made. A long and arduous preparation of the race to receive that revelation was a necessity of the case, and even then all but a few choice spirits were unable to bear the full light of truth.

It is true that the Old Testament, as compared to the New, is "as moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine." But the moon has its place in the heavens as well as the sun. The Fathers had a saying about the two Testaments that may be rendered in English thus:

In the Old the New is concealed;
In the New the Old is revealed.

The current depreciation of the Old Testament is the result of ignorance; to many Christians it is virtually an unknown book. With the exception of the Psalms, a story here and there in the historical books, and a chapter or two from the prophets, the Old Testament is not enough studied to be understood. With fuller knowledge would come truer appreciation, and flippant criticism would give place to reverent praise. No one who has once learned what a treasure-house the Old Testament is, will gainsay the words of Paul to Timothy—spoken, be it remembered, not of the New Testament, but of the Old—"Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness."

PRESIDENT PATTON'S TREMENDOUS PAPER.

From *The Christian Advocate* (Methodist), New York, Feb. 6, 1890.

THE *Independent* publishes a very able paper read by President Francis L. Patton, of Princeton College, before the Presbyterian Social Union, in this city, Dec. 2, 1889. We have read it with attention. He defends the Westminster Confession as respects its apparent neglect of the divine love on the ground that no one denied it, and "therefore there was no need of setting it forth in antithesis to error," and that the divines "were able to distinguish between an exhortation and a summary of doctrine." He then shows that neither the mercy of God nor His love is neglected.

On the subject of elect infants he tries to hold the interpreter to the language of the Confession, and will not allow that the citation of passages from the writings of the Westminster divines or the debates of the Westminster Assembly should affect our interpretation of the Confession. He says that "the Confession teaches that only the elect will be saved; that those of the elect who are capable of faith are saved by faith; that those of the elect, such as elect infants, are saved without faith." He admits that the Confession does not "say that all who die in infancy are among the elect; but neither does it say that any who die in infancy are among the non-elect." On this we remark that the radical difficulty is that the general spirit of the Confession and the debates would require the idea of some non-elect infants and would justify their damnation. The use of the phrase in the Confession for the purpose of illustration would never have been made without the underlying assumption in the mind of the makers that some infants were elect and some were not.

When President Patton comes to speak

of the doctrine of reprobation, that we do no injustice to the spirit and statements of the Confession appears from what he then said: "Calvinism teaches that God elects individuals to eternal life out of His mere good pleasure. Now, if men are saved because they are elected, and God elects some, certainly some must be left. We may say that God passed them by, or reprobated them, or did not save them." Of course, if that be true, non-elect infants passed by, reprobated, not saved, are as really in the spirit of the Confession as any other non-elect persons. This also is made more clear by his vindication of the damnation of all the heathen, "be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law of that religion they do profess."

We are encouraged to believe that our notice of this subject is not a violation of inter-Denominational courtesy because President Patton says: "It must amuse the theologians of the Methodist Church to notice that Presbyterian office-bearers are trying to persuade the Church that honors Charles Hodge and Henry B. Smith as its great dogmatic theologians to go over bodily to the platform of the Remonstrants." It does amuse us, except that we do not find pleasure in seeing a great historic Church "in the pangs of transformation." It also amuses us to see the name of Henry B. Smith coupled with that of Charles Hodge in this passage, because, though he was indeed a great dogmatic theologian as well as a metaphysician of the highest grade, unless we greatly mistake, he furnished to *The Independent* many years ago an article designed to show that there is no insuperable difficulty in the way of a union of Presbyterians and Methodists. Certainly we have read such an article from his pen, either as an original communication to *The Independent* or as quoted in an article in that paper.

President Patton gives a fine definition of the distinction between Calvinism and Arminianism: "Discussions regarding the divine decrees among the Reformed theologians resulted in the separation of the Remonstrants or Arminian party, Calvinists holding that election is of individuals to everlasting life out of the mere good pleasure of God; Arminians, that election is of individuals to everlasting life on the ground of foreseen faith." We thank thee, President Patton, for that word. It is beautiful in simplicity and definiteness. He says, as a conclusion from this: "Arminians may be regarded historically as belonging to the Reformed family, but they are not Calvinists." Then he says: "Starting with depravity, which all Protestants believe in, we have the problem of redemption solved in sufficient grace for all, according to the Arminians; baptismal regeneration, according to the Lutherans; and sovereign election, according to the Calvinists."

President Patton is a great man in the best sense of the word. It was he who grappled Professor Swing and by the power of truth isolated that subtle underminer of the Presbyterian faith and forced him into the independent position which any one who sets himself above the written Word should be willing, or if not willing, should be compelled to assume. It was he who, as a theological teacher in Princeton, was selected to succeed the venerable and renowned President M'Cosh at the head of an institution rivalling in fame and power the best on this continent. He sets himself thoroughly against revision, believes in friendly relations with all Denominations, but says: "The reunion of Christendom, as that phrase is commonly understood, I do not believe in." His ability is equalled by his frankness.

We came to the conclusion, months ago, that it is impossible to revise the substance of that Confession without the introduction of the Arminian principles; that the Presbyterian Church cannot eliminate one doctrine without the logical overthrow of the Augustinian and Calvinistic fabric; and therefore that those who advocate revision cannot get what they want without an entire change in the doctrinal platform of the Church, which will make them practically Methodists. And this could not be done without a division of the Church. Only twenty years ago we saw in this city, with reverent admiration, a reunion of the New and Old School bodies of the Presbyterian Church accepting the Confession in "its historical, that is to say, its Augustinian or Calvinistic, sense." We should be sorry to see two sects instead of one.

The discussions thus far in the New York and other Presbyteries justify the presumption that the revisers will get nothing as to the substance of doctrine, but simply a coating of sugar laid over the theological pills, which they find bitter in the mouth, but which thorough-going, old-fashioned Calvinists maintain have a marvellously beneficial effect upon the health and soundness of the system, or that if they get anything more the body *must* divide.

THOMAS COKE, LL.D.

From *The Christian Advocate* (Methodist), New York, Jan. 23, 1890.

DEAR DR. BUCKLEY: Mrs. Charlotte Simonds Griffin, a widow residing here in Kingston, a member of the Methodist Episcopal church, and an interested reader of *The Christian Advocate* for many years, called at the district parsonage this morning, and, in speaking of the hitherto unpublished letter of Bishop Coke, which appeared in last week's *Advocate,* says that she has in her possession papers received from her father which throw considerable light on the eventful period in the life of that eminent divine. Her mother, then Mary Hazleton, of County Tyrone, Ireland, was in 1797 under engagement of marriage to one Joseph Simonds, a school-teacher and lay preacher of the same county. Bishop Coke, preaching in that neighborhood, became deeply interested in Miss Hazleton, and feeling impressed that the Lord intended her for his life companion, called on her father and requested his permission to ask her hand in marriage. Mr. Hazleton replied that he would cheerfully give his consent to so honorable a union were it not for the fact that his daughter was already under promise of marriage to Mr. Joseph Simonds. With his high sense of honor this answer put an end to all the Bishop's plans concerning Miss Hazleton, and in a short time he officiated at her marriage with Mr. Simonds. This may have proved one of the great turning-points in his life. Like Asbury, he never married. After this disappointment in Ireland he seems to have given himself more zealously than ever to evangelistic and missionary labors. He immediately revisited America to stir up the Methodists there to greater earnestness; the next year returned to Europe and established missions in Ireland and Wales; then wrote his commentary on the Old Testament, his history of the Bible, history of the work in the West Indies, and many other valuable works. His closing years were devoted entirely to missionary labors.

Through his influence a mission was established in Sierra Leone in 1811, and at Ceylon in 1813. At the Conference of 1813 five preachers volunteered to go with him as missionaries to Ceylon. He at once accepted them, and donated $30,000 from his private fortune to defray the expense that would be incurred. They embarked December 30th, 1813, and four months from then, while yet on their voyage, Coke was found dead in his cabin and was buried at sea. When the news of his death reached America Bishop Asbury said: "A minister of Christ, in zeal, in labors, and in services, the greatest man of the last century."

Yours very truly,
R. W. VAN SCHOICK.

TWO ASPECTS OF SYRIAN LIFE.

BY V. F. P.

From *The Christian Weekly*, New York, Jan. 11, 1890.

IN order to understand why it is so hard to Christianize Syria, we must know of the religion of the Turks who rule the land. They are Mohammedans and got their religion from the Arabs, whom they conquered. It seemed at one time as if they were going to conquer all Europe. The Sultan of the Turks claims to be the successor of Mohammed, and to have authority over the whole Moslem world, even in India and China. But the Persians and some others deny this, saying their caliph must be an Arab like their prophet.

Mohammed was born 570 A.D., at Mecca, Arabia. The religion he founded is called Islam, and those who profess it are called Moslems. Islam means "entire submission to God." Nearly one eighth of the people of the world are Moslems. At their great university at Cairo, ten thousand students are under training, ready to go, at any time, to any part of the world to teach Islam. Very few who have professed this faith have ever been led to renounce it for Christianity. This is partly owing to persecution, for the Moslem holds it his bounden duty to kill any one who abjures his faith in the prophet.

When Mohammed was a young man he used to travel with some of the caravans going northward into Syria for trade. During these journeys he doubtless saw and heard much of the Jews and Christians, till, in some way he was led to accept the truth that there is but one God, and that it was wicked to worship images. His preaching this roused his fellow-townsmen against him. After a time he began to have what he called visions from God, which he wrote in a book called the Koran. If he wished to do anything, however wicked, he had only to add a chapter to his book and give it out as a message directly from God.

He and his followers undertook to advance the faith by force, and fearfully cruel wars resulted. Their creed is: "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is His prophet." This is repeated over and over again as the article of faith. Belief in one God and its utter rejection of all idols have given Mohammedanism its great power. No images or pictures are seen in its mosques. Mohammed commanded his followers to pursue and kill all who would not follow him ; it is a religion of hatred, the opposite of Christ's law of love. It is a religion of forms. There are certain ceremonies to be observed, and in a very precise way. "The rules regarding religious exercises are very exact. Prayer is to be offered five times each day, and if it is not offered according to rule it loses all power. Unless one has first bathed, and unless the bathing was done after a prescribed form, the prayer is naught. According to the law of Islam, if a man washes his left hand before his right, or his nose before his teeth, he cannot pray acceptably. So, too, if the order of his prostrations is not exact, and if his face is not turned toward Mecca, his prayer is in vain. We remember seeing some Mohammedan pilgrims try to pray in the midst of a storm on the Mediterranean Sea. The vessel was tossing about and the poor bewildered people knew not in which direction Mecca was, and so they could not pray." Such reverence do they show to Mecca that they bury their dead with their sightless eyes toward it.

It is very impressive to the traveller in the East to hear the call for prayer from the minarets of the mosques. Wherever he may be, the Moslem instantly prostrates himself and goes through the forms with apparent devotion. This makes them seem very religious, but as they are seen cursing, cheating, and lying without any conscience whatever, this impression soon vanishes. A man will curse because he is interrupted or not allowed to pray. Lying is their especial vice. They appear to have almost lost the power to appreciate the truth and speak it. Their women are the slaves of the men.

There are no wheeled vehicles in Syria to-day except a few imported ones, neither carts, drays nor wagons. Since the time of the Arab conquest, everything but the horse, camel and ass has been neglected. To these only were they accustomed, and they despised all other means of travel and transportation. Good roads then were not necessary ; they quickly disappeared, the natives tell you that carriage-roads cannot be made, though they could be constructed at a moderate expense in nearly all parts of the kingdom. But as long as the Turk governs none will be made. "Even the Christian inhabitants of Lebanon, where good roads are most needed, have no adequate appreciation of them, and take no pains to make them. They drive their loaded camels, mules, donkeys, along frightful paths, and endanger their own necks by riding over the same from generation to generation, without dreaming of any improvement." You must educate your nerves into indifference in this matter, and get ready as soon as possible to flounder over all sorts of break-neck places in the course of your pilgrimage.

In Proverbs we read : "Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eyelids look straight before thee. Turn not to the right hand or to the left, remove thy foot from evil." This you must be careful to do, lest you be reminded of Balaam and his much-abused ass. His path, like ours, had a wall on this side and a wall on that ; the angel with drawn sword was in front, and the poor beast thrust herself against the wall and crushed the prophet's foot. Now this file of donkeys, with rough stone from the quarries on their backs, completely blocks up this narrow way, and if you attempt to force your horse past them, either on the right or the left, you will also meet with a crushed foot. Retreat to the next side alley, and let them pass.

It is only near Beirut that you meet such an annoyance. These crooked, narrow paths through the gardens of Beirut do, indeed, require one to obey the wise man's directions most closely. Only a few feet wide, with high walls on either side, and overshadowed by the rough arms and thorny palms of the prickly pear, the rider must keep wide awake, or he will find his face transfixed with the sharp spikes of the one, or his foot crushed against the other.

On the rocky, slippery path you see a commentary on the Mosaic Code. "See those men lifting a poor donkey that has fallen under its load." Moses says : "If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldst forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help him." Now the people lifting this donkey are bitter enemies—Maronites and Druses—quite recently engaged in a bloody social war, and ready to begin again on the very first opportunity, and yet they help to lift the ass that is lying under his burden, as though they were the best friends in the world. The plan is to lift the beast to its feet without taking off the load, which is a tedious business. Manners and customs, men and things, roads and loads, continue very much what they were three thousand years ago.

You read of the crooked, narrow streets, no sidewalks and gutters in the middle. Walking along such a one progress becomes impossible for a line of loaded camels comes by. Only by bowing the head, creeping and dodging under, can you hope to pass. When a string of donkeys carrying such bundles of brush and water that their loads fairly brush both sides of the street meet you, your only course is to step into some recess in the street until they are gone. All the while a man is shouting "at the top of his voice: 'Daharak! wûshak! daharak! wûshak! Your back! your face! your back! your face!' to warn all concerned to look sharply before and behind," or they may be run over, crushed against the wall, or have their clothes and faces torn by the brush; a very necessary admonition, is it not?

PRESBYTERIAN REFORMERS.

From *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), Boston, Jan. 23, 1890.

It is one of our objects to keep our readers informed of the force and tendency of modern theological movements. We have had much to say lately concerning the active movement in the Presbyterian Church. In no body of Christians at the present time is there a greater interest in the relation of theology to modern thought. In the Protestant Reformation, Presbyterianism had its bold reformers. Protestantism owes it a debt for its service which must be gratefully recognized, but to-day there is a new reformation going on of not less importance than that which took place under Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin. The breeze of reformation, bringing with it freshening thought and earnest conviction, was first felt in the Calvinistic churches in New England. The Unitarian and Universalist movements were the result of that impulse; but now the breeze is blowing steadily through the other churches. The agitation in the Presbyterian Church, turning as it does on the question of creed revision, illustrates the solvent influence of modern criticism, disintegrating the old and decayed formulas only that it may make room for fresh growths of religious conviction. Presbyterianism is feeling the influence of a new rational and ethical wave. The conservative and progressive forces in that body stand opposed to each other. The attitude of the combatants is well represented in two pamphlets before us: one is "Whither, Oh Whither? Tell me Where," by Rev. Dr. McCosh; the other is "Creed Revision in the Presbyterian Churches," by Rev. Dr. Schaff of the Union Theological Seminary, both of them published by Charles Scribner's Sons.

Dr. McCosh's pamphlet is interrogative only in form. It is an attempt to answer the recent book of Rev. Dr. Briggs of the Union Theological Seminary, reviewed at length in these columns. Dr. McCosh is garrulous enough, but his pamphlet is rather a personal protest than an argument. Indeed, he is conscious of the weakness of his reply, when at the close he says, "I have done little more than show that it should be answered." His pamphlet is a blank cartridge; it makes some noise, but contains no bullet. Dr. Briggs is perfectly safe in his casemate against a discharge of smoke.

Not less eminent in the Presbyterian fold is Rev. Dr. Schaff, who takes up the progressive side. He is widely known as the professor of church history in Union Theological Seminary. For some years he has set his face against the extreme Calvinism represented by his colleague, Dr. Shedd. He has not hesitated to boldly denounce "its doctrine of reprobation, preterition, and the wholesale damnation of the non-Christian world." Likewise in this pamphlet Dr. Schaff does not shun to declare the counsel of God unto his brethren. His pamphlet consists of two papers, one originally contributed to the *Presbyterian Review,* but now doubled in size, and the other delivered before the New York Presbytery.

Taking up his first paper, we find Dr. Schaff acknowledging the effect on theological discussion of the progressive spirit of the age. "We live," he says, "in an age of research, discovery, and progress; and whoever refuses to go ahead must be content to be left behind to be outgrown. Whatever lives moves; and whatever ceases to move ceases to live. It is impossible for individual Christians or churches to be stationary: they must either go forward or backward." Dr. Schaff then shows that revision of creed is not a new thing, that it runs through the history of Christian doctrine, that Catholic and Protestant creeds alike have been subjected to it. He shows that the revision movement is not confined to America; it pervades the whole Protestant family. In the Established Church of Scotland, the difficulty has been met by broadening the terms of subscription. The Free Church of Scotland has resolved by a large majority upon a revision of the confession. The Protestant Church of England has sought a solution by abridging the Westminster Confession.

We have pointed out from time to time, on satisfactory evidence that has come to our hands, that Presbyterian ministers do not generally believe the published creed of that Church. We are supported in this position by Dr. Schaff's unqualified testimony. "A growing number of ministers, elders, and students are calling for relief from bondage to certain doctrines which the theology of the age has outgrown, which are no more taught in the pulpits, and would not be tolerated in the pews. Some theologians still defend them, but few students believe them. I know of no Presbyterian minister in these United States who preaches the decree of reprobation or preterition, the irresponsibility of the sinner for not accepting the gospel, the limitation of the atonement to the small circle of the elect, and the eternal damnation of non-elect infants dying in infancy, and the damnation of the non-Christian world—heathen, Jews, and Mohammedans." Dr. Schaff quotes Dr. Cuyler of Brooklyn as saying that "ninety-nine hundredths do not believe these features of the Westminster Confession." When Dr. Schaff read his more moderate statement in Presbytery, he asked the brethren present to contradict his assertion by rising, if any of them ever preached on the decree of reprobation and preterition; but no one rose. Silence gives consent. We have likewise urged that consistency requires that either the Presbyterian Church should conform to its standards or that its standards should be made to conform to its beliefs, a thought which is repeated by Dr. Schaff in the following terms: "And yet these doctrines are supposed to be taught expressly or implicitly by the Westminster standards. If not, then let us disown them publicly and officially beyond the power of contradiction. *What cannot be preached in the pulpit ought not to be taught in a Confession of Faith, either expressly or by fair logical inference. On the other hand, what is taught in the Confession ought to be preached in the pulpit.*"

Dr. Schaff then takes up various features of the Westminster Confession in detail. He refuses to wrest words from their original meaning, and shows the bald, hard inhumanity of the Calvinistic doctrine. The Confession he says is "for the exclusive benefit of the elect. To this small inside circle all is bright and hopeful; but outside of it all is dark as midnight. It is the product of the most polemical and most intolerant age of Christendom." Dr. Schaff regards it as "highly significant, though almost incredible, that the clearest and strongest modern reproduction of the Westminster Confession," by which he refers to his colleague Dr. Shedd's *Dogmatic Theology*, "ends not with heaven, but with hell, and devotes only three pages to heaven and eighty-seven to hell." Referring to the doctrine of infant damnation, Dr. Schaff shows that it was held by Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, and the Westminster divines. "Is it rational," he asks, "is it Christian, to conceive even the possibility that an infinitely good and merciful God should create, in his own image, countless millions of human beings to hurry them from the cradle to the tomb, and from the tomb to eternal perdition, before they have committed any actual sin? Is such a God not a monstrous caricature of the God of the Bible, who is a God of love?"

Dr. Schaff ends his article with the following language: "Let us be honest, and confess that old Calvinism is fast dying out. It has done a great work, and has done it well, but cannot satisfy the demands of the present age. We live in the nineteenth, and not in the seventeenth, century. Every age must produce its own theology and has its own mission to fulfil. We may learn wisdom and experience from the past, but we ought not to be slaves of the past and recognize no infallible authority but that of Christ. We must believe in the Holy Spirit, who is guiding the Church to ever higher life and light. He produced reformations in the past: he will produce greater reformations in the future." "We need a theology," he continues, "and a confession that is more human than Calvinism, more divine than Arminianism, and more Christian and catholic than either—a confession as broad and deep as God's love, and as strict and severe as God's justice. We need a theology and a confession that will not only bind the members of one denomination together, but be also a bond of sympathy between the various folds of the one flock of Christ, and prepare the way for the great work of the future—the reunion of Christendom in the Creed of Christ."

Dr. Schaff's criticism is one of the most powerful that has been uttered against the Westminster Confession. Sixty years ago, Channing showed the moral argument against Calvinism. The Presbyterian body is moving toward the position that Dr. Channing took in that famous address, and its movement is in the direction of light, liberty, and love.

THE GROWTH OF UNCHECKED SIN.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Jan. 9, 1890.

Three facts demand attention in relation to this subject.

One is the fact that when a specific temptation has been yielded to, it is easier afterward than it was before to fall before that particular temptation. A precedent has been established. A beginning has been made toward the formation of a habit. So far as there was an element of pleasure in sinning, this pleasure has been experienced, and the memory of it remains. So far as it was necessary to resist conscience in order to overcome its appeals, this resistance has been made successfully, and the memory of that, too, remains. The soul's relation to the sin in question is distinctly less hostile and more tolerant than it was before, and every time that the sin is committed this hostility diminishes, and this tolerance assumes more of the spirit of willing consent. That is to say, the power of an unchecked sin over its victim grows steadily.

Another is the fact that yielding to one temptation renders it easier to yield to other temptations. They all are outgrowths of the same root—selfishness. They all therefore are akin to each other, and naturally lead to one another. He who has cheated some one is far more strongly tempted to lie, in order to prevent detection, than if he had dealt honestly. A sin is like a seed in that, if let alone, it will produce a thousand other equally dangerous seeds, and the worst of the truth is that a seed of this sort is not confined, as in the natural world, to the reproduction of its own kind alone, but brings forth a thousand different sorts of evil seeds. The power of an unchecked sin is duplicated and reduplicated through its affinities with all other forms of sin.

A third, and the most significant, is the fact that unchecked sin develops the love of sin. It produces an evil state of the mind and heart, which is worse than the worst specific acts of sin. This inner condition is that reached when sin, at least in the forms which attract us, no longer seems repulsive ; when we yield to it no more with actual shrinking, but assert to ourselves that, although it may not be justifiable upon the highest theory of the Christian life, it is something which to average human nature is excusable. Alas for us if we have reached this state of mind ! Only a power actually divine can rescue us. It is true that the practice and pursuit of holiness beget within us the love of holiness. It is equally true that continued yielding to evil causes us in due time to love evil and prefer it. We are face to face with the alternative. Which shall we choose ?

Let these thoughts sink deeply into our hearts now as the new year opens, and as we try to adjust ourselves afresh to our spiritual responsibilities !

A WORD IN DEFENCE OF THE CATHOLIC CONGRESS.

BY LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON.

From *The Christian Union*, New York, Jan. 23, 1890.

Amid many things to respect and approve in the doings of the late " Catholic Congress," the covert reassertion of the utterly hopeless claim of the Pope to temporal power as a secular monarch makes, to most American ears, a harsh dissonance, as if a false note had been struck. There can be little doubt that it needed all the force of the clerical censorship, to which the utterances of laymen in that body were submitted, to keep the American Catholic sentiment on this point from a dangerous variance from the Roman, or rather the Vatican, standard. It is especially difficult in the case of that large class of American Catholics who are constantly setting up, in the name of eternal justice and indefeasible human rights, the claim of " Home Rule" and " Ireland for the Irish," to " catch on" at once to the other tune, and sing Rome not for the Romans but for the Pope as a king by divine right.

But whether or not we have rightly observed the current of thought among American Catholics on this point, there can be no mistake about the sentiment of the American people generally—that it is one of impatience, not to say indignation, at the stupid anachronism of the demand to re-enslave the people of Central Italy under the absolute tyranny of the Pope-king or (putting it in another form) to inflict once more upon the most eminent personage among Christian ministers the old and intolerable disgrace of being the despotic head of the worst-governed State in Christendom.

Now, in all fairness toward our Catholic fellow-citizens, in a position of no small embarrassment between the requirements of their Church and the dictates of their feeling, we are bound to make a large allowance for the weight of the reasons which forbid them to modify their opinions on the subject of the Pope's temporal sovereignty. I do not think the matter is generally understood, even among Roman Catholics themselves.

Ever since the Vatican Council it has to be admitted that an infallible head, a living oracle of divine truth, is necessary to the Catholic Church according to the Roman conception of it. If this fails, the divine promises, in the Roman interpretation of them, have also failed, and the Church is nowhere. The foundations are destroyed, and what shall the righteous do?

Now, among the essential conditions to the exercise of the divine gift of infallibility by a Pope is "the full enjoyment of his freedom." I use the language of the able, learned, and most orthodox Dr. Hergenröther, author of "Anti-Janus." He says: "In this most theologians agree, that a definition *ex cathedra* has then been pronounced when the Pope, *in the full enjoyment of his freedom*, has, in a decree addressed to the whole Church," etc. The point became one of vital consequence in the controversy that preceded the Vatican Council, when the relentless polemics of Munich brought up the case of Pope Liberius as one clearly convicted of defining heresy. The defenders of infallibility had to "plead by confession and avoidance:" *Liberii lapsus non certus, nec si certus voluntarius.* It cannot be proved that he did define heresy, and if he did. he was not his own master; he was under the power of the Emperor Constantius, and the fear of the Emperor was the motive of his act. You cannot expect a Pope to be infallible in those circumstances. Even when he speaks *ex cathedra* as universal doctor, he is just as likely to be wrong as right, if he is in duress. This argument was used with much effect in getting out of the excessively annoying difficulty about Pope Liberius.

Now, here is the perfectly horrible mess into which things have been put by the indiscreet act of the Italian Government, just after the infallibility decree was proclaimed, in taking possession of Rome. Ever since that time, now nearly twenty years, the Pope, first Pius and then Leo, has been in duress. He takes every favorable opportunity, and some deplorably unfavorable ones, to declare, *urbi et orbi*, to the city and the world, that he has no freedom, that he is "a moral prisoner." Consequently, for these nearly twenty years the Catholic Church has had no infallible head. The gates of hell have prevailed against it. And, inasmuch as the chance of a holy alliance to make war on Italy and put the Pope back again as king has dwindled to zero, it may be assumed that (in default of a prodigious miracle) the existing status will continue.

This distressing perplexity to the faithful is the very emergency for which the official pontifical gift of infallibility is needed—the *nodus vindice dignus.* How, except by an infallible utterance, are we to know for certain what is the truth in this matter? And yet how are we going to get our infallible utterance on this or any other point? The Pope says he is in duress. If it is true, then (say the Catholic theologians) he is fallible, even when making definitions of faith; you cannot be sure that he will not define flat heresy, as alleged against Popes Honorius and Liberius. If it is untrue, then what? We shudder at the alternative that he is not only fallible, but actually false. If he is infallible, he must be mistaken; but if he is fallible, he may be correct.

This is a perfect bull of Bashan of a dilemma, and I submit that there is much to be said in apology for those who, in terror of two such horns, take the short cut to the only visible refuge, and propose to solve the sphinx-like riddle by setting up the States of the Church again, under the old Donation of Constantine. I confess that I do not see how they are going to do it; but then neither do I see how they can do anything else. It will never do in the world to admit the impious charge of the Italian people that the Pope for twenty years has been shamming and sulking, that he is not in duress at all, but has a great deal more liberty than Simon Peter ever had.

One thought, I confess, has forced itself upon my mind as I have pondered this perplexing case. These are parlous times, when it behooves the managers of ecclesiastical affairs to take every precaution against mistakes. At such times, a pontiff infallible in his own right, although, as we have seen, absolutely necessary to the Church, is a most dangerous necessity. The whole pontificate of Pius IX. was an illustration of this, both his early reforming days and his later days when, in the bull *Quanta cura* and its accompanying Syllabus, he committed the Church to that monstrous string of propositions which it has been the constant effort of the Church ever since, in all civilized countries, to wriggle out of. The first years of Leo XIII., in one or two bold utterances, suggested the same peril—that the infallible, however held in with bit and bridle, might sometime get the bit in his teeth and say something "from the seat" which should come back, like the infelicities of Liberius and Honorius and others, to plague the Church in future years or centuries. In this view, a more ingenious and judicious expedient could hardly be devised than this of keeping up before the face of the smiling world the solemn protest against holding the meek and suffering Pope "a moral prisoner." In the pinch of future controversy as to any pontificial utterance later than 1871, it will always be possible to say, "Oh, pshaw! that does not count. Duress, you know."

"THE OLD MEETING-HOUSE."

BY J. B. CHAMPNEY, GIRARD, ILL.

From *The Universalist*, Chicago, Jan. 18, 1890.

Perhaps it might interest some one to give a brief description of the "Old Meeting-House" as it stood and flourished in my boyhood days, together with some of the customs of worship which prevailed during its days of glory. The house was the largest building within twenty miles, and was built in the year 1790. At the northeast corner was a horse block. There was neither tower nor portico; the exterior was never painted, and of course presented a dingy appearance. The windows were small, with heavy sash and panes of 7 x 9 glass. There were three entrances, one at each end and one in front. Opposite to the front door was the pulpit; and in each of the front corners was a flight of stairs leading to the galleries. The walls were plastered, though never whitewashed. The galleries were lofty, resting on columns about a foot in diameter. There was a row of wall pews, surrounding the house both above and below. On the half next the door were twelve square pews, esteemed the best in the house; while on the half next the pulpit were long seats, extending on either side from the broad aisle to the side aisles.

These were good, substantial benches, made of thick plank and capped with good-sized joists. The galleries were furnished with similar seats. The pews were occupied by the principal families, while the long seats were free to all, and were occupied by what might be called the common people. Over the stairs at the southeast corner were the negroes' seats. The pulpit was lofty and the ascent to it was by a flight of stairs outside. It had a recess or rostrum in which the speaker stood; behind him was a curtainless arched window; above him was a curiously gilded canopy, about six feet in diameter, resembling in form a turnip cut in two; it was called a sounding-board, and hung near the speaker's head by a slender iron rod from the ceiling; and beneath him, in front of the pulpit, were the deacons' seats, in a sort of pew, when they sat facing the congregation, with the communion-table hanging by hinges in front of them. The pews were about six feet square, and the seats were hung by hinges so that they might be turned up as the congregation rose at prayers, as was the goodly custom of our fathers; and the "slam-bang" as they were carefully turned down again, at the close of prayers, was not unlike a volley of musketry.

Behold the congregation as it assembles on the Sabbath. Some of them came mounted on horses; the father with his wife or daughter on a pillion behind him, and perhaps his little boy astride before him. They ride up to the stone horse-block and dismount. The young men and maidens approach on foot. The two long hours of service in winter were indeed tedious. They came a long distance on ox-sleds, or perhaps have skimmed over the deep, untrodden snow on rackets. They enter the house stamping the snow from their feet and tramping along the uncarpeted aisles with their cowhide boots. Let us enter with them. The wintry blasts howl around and shriek among the loose clapboards; the half-fastened windows clatter; and the walls echo to the thumping of thick boots, to keep up the circulation, while clouds of vapor issue from their mouths; and as the man of God raises his hands in prayer, he must protect them with shaggy mittens. So comfortless and cold, it makes one shudder to think of it. Every man was in his appropriate place. A very important officer in those days in the church was the tithing man who took his seat in the gallery with whip in hand to maintain order and quiet among the boys. Sunday was a day dreaded by the young. During the long prayers, and long indeed they were, a pause was made at a certain stage of it for those who chose to sit down. The sermon begins, and advances by regular approach up to the eighthly and even to sixteenthly; it was a great relief when the end came. Then the singers, who had real work to perform, lined off Tate and Brady, two lines at a time, by a person selected for the purpose, and sang with good nasal twang and hearty good-will to some good old tune; and finally the benediction is pronounced. The congregation still remains in its place to go out in prescribed order; first the minister, and as he passes the deacons, they follow—then those in the front seats, and so on in successive order. After a brief recess all reassembled for the afternoon service. The day ends by "singing the Catechism." That Westminster Assembly's Catechism—who that was trained in the early part of the century shall forget it?

"In Adam's fall we sinned all;
My Book and heart shall never part."

The story of John Rogers, Auger's Prayer, and Dialogue between Youth, Christ and the Devil, were the only books besides the Bible and Psalm Book allowed in the hands of youth on the Sabbath. The Catechism concluded the religious observance of the day.

As those who were actors in these almost forgotten scenes recall them, with a thousand associations which it is impossible to recount, it seems like a dream.

It will be remembered that in those days the minister was settled for life, and all over eighteen years of age were taxed to pay his salary, whatever the belief might be. He could preach infant damnation and there was none to dispute. Everything was strictly orthodox, and travelling on the Sabbath was prohibited. All school teachers must be of the same faith, and the most important lesson to learn was the Catechism, and woe to the child that failed to recite it. As the mind turns back to scenes of early days, and then to witness the progress and advancement in religion and all other subjects up to this time, I feel that I have passed through the dark ages of the world.

PARAGRAPHIC.

The Christian Advocate tells a good story of a pastor who objected to an increase of salary. The worthy pastor declined the advance in his salary for the three following substantial reasons: 1st, said he, "because you can't afford to give more than $300. 2d. Because my preaching isn't worth more than that. 3d. Because I have to collect my salary, which heretofore has been the hardest part of my labors among you. If I have to collect an additional hundred, it will kill me." Happily in these times the pastor is relieved of this trouble of collection, and we never hear anything from him about his receipts being in excess of his ability. Apropos of this, however, are old Mrs. Smith's remarks to the distinguished Dr. ——, as she was ascending the high stone steps leading to the vestibule of his large church: "Dear me," she said, "it's fearful warm, and these steps are so steep." "Allow me to assist you, madam," said the affable divine, offering her his arm. When they had reached the top step, she asked: "Who is to preach here to-day, sir?" "The regular parson, madam," replied the courteous doctor with a smile of approbation. "O my soul! let me go down again; I would rather listen to an old saw than him." "Quite right, my dear madam, I wouldn't go in to listen to him myself if I were not paid for it."

Here is a good story about a bishop—indeed, it would be a good story even about a dean. Bishop was homeward bound from the States, travelling luxuriously in a double cabin with Mrs. Bishop. It was a very hot night, thunder in the air, and as the Atlantic liner slipped through the water, doing her eighteen or nineteen knots an hour, the cabin would be lit up with the lightning flashes. Mrs. Bishop could not sleep for the heat. Bishop, appealed to, lumbered out of his berth, and opened a porthole. Suddenly there lobbed in through the porthole a wooden ball attached to a string. Bishop was perplexed, but he tied it up, coiling the string by a nail in the wall, and then retired to rest. The ball was an apple of discord in that peaceful cabin, for it hit against the side of the vessel as she lurched, and Mrs. Bishop grew querulous and disturbed. Up started the poor Bishop again, and, to end matters, he uncoiled the cord, and put the ball safe and sound under his pillow. There was a heavy thunderstorm, but the Bishop slept soundly that night. Next morning at breakfast, the captain presiding, he told the tale with a good deal of episcopal solemnity and detail. The captain laughed consumedly. Bishop laughed too, thinking his story a good one. Then the captain told him that the ball was the end of the lightning conductor. Bishop that night looked under his pillow before going to bed, and slept with a closed porthole.—*The Living Church, Chicago.*

It is not probable that the universities of Japan can offer an unlimited number of professorships to American instructors, otherwise there might be an exodus of our college faculties in that direction, so great are the emoluments of the position. Professor C. Merriwether, who went recently from Johns Hopkins University to accept a professorship of history in the University of Tokio, Japan, was received with every mark of distinction. A palace was given him for a residence with a retinue of more than fifty servants. A stable containing some of the finest horses in the kingdom was placed at his disposal, and all his appointments are on a scale befitting royalty. It now remains to be seen whether a plain American accustomed to the moderate salary of a college professor can adapt himself to such sumptuous surroundings and an army of Japanese lackeys without deriving more embarrassment than comfort from the situation.—*Christian Herald.*

The Pope is making all possible resistance to the erection of a synagogue in Rome. Finding opposition of the "Grief and Bitterness" sort the most impressive, he is trying to have it understood that he is weeping his heart blood over the matter. The possibility is that the Italian Government may forbid it. But if so, what security is there for any one of the Protestant churches or institutions there? The Jew has a right to his places of religious worship, and the spirit that would forbid it savors rankly of Inquisition days and methods. The Jew is not a Christian, to be sure, but he is a spiritual and a monotheistic believer, and is not a persecutor. We certainly think that he is less of a menace than the Romanist, and Italian liberty should not be forbidden to him and his synagogue.—*Herald and Presbyter.*

IV.

AGNOSTICISM.

A Reply to Professor Huxley.

BY W. C. MAGEE, BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

My reply to Professor Huxley is accordingly confined to the strictly personal questions raised by his references to myself. I hope that, after making due allowance for Hibernicisms and for imperfect acquaintance with English modes of thought and expression, he will accept my explanation as sufficient.

V.

AGNOSTICISM: A REJOINDER.

BY PROFESSOR THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

The concluding paragraph of the Bishop of Peterborough's reply to the appeal which I addressed to him in the penultimate number of this review, leads me to think that he has seen a personal reference where none was intended. I had ventured to suggest that the demand that a man should call himself an infidel, savored very much of the flavor of a "bull;" and, even had the Right Reverend prelate been as stolid an Englishman as I am, I should have entertained the hope, that the oddity of talking of the cowardice of persons who object to call themselves by a nickname, which must in their eyes be as inappropriate as, in the intention of the users, it is offensive, would have struck him. But, to my surprise, the bishop has not even yet got sight of that absurdity. He thinks, that if I accept Dr. Wace's definition of his much-loved epithet, I am logically bound not only to adopt the titles of infidel and miscreant, but that I shall "even glory in those titles." As I have shown, "infidel" merely means somebody who does not believe what you believe yourself, and therefore Dr. Wace has a perfect right to call, say, my old Egyptian donkey-driver, Nooleh, and myself, infidels, just as Nooleh and I have a right to call him an infidel. The ludicrous aspect of the thing comes in only when either of us demands that the two others should so label themselves. It is a terrible business to have to explain a mild jest, and I pledge myself not to run the risk of offending in this way again. I see how wrong I was in trusting to the bishop's sense of the ludicrous, and I beg leave unreservedly to withdraw my misplaced confidence. And I take this course the more readily as there is something about which I am obliged again to trouble the Bishop of Peterborough, which is certainly no jesting matter. Referring to my question, the bishop says that if they (the terms "infidel" and "miscreant")

> should not be so proved to be applicable, then I should hold it to be as unreasonable to expect him to call himself by such names as he, I suppose, would hold it to be to expect us Christians to admit, without better reason than he has yet given us, that Christianity is "the sorry stuff" which, with his "profoundly" moral readiness to say "unpleasant" things, he is pleased to say that it is.*

According to those "English modes of thought and expression," of which the bishop seems to have but a poor opinion, this is a deliberate assertion that I had said that Christianity is "sorry stuff." And, according to the same standard of fair dealing, it is, I think, absolutely necessary for the Bishop of Peterborough to produce the evidence on which this positive statement is based. I shall be unfeignedly surprised if he is successful in proving it; but it is proper for me to wait and see.

Those who passed from Dr. Wace's article in the last number of this review to the anticipatory confutation of it which followed in "The New Reformation," must have enjoyed the pleasure of a dramatic surprise—just as when the fifth act of a new play proves unexpectedly bright and interesting. Mrs. Ward will, I hope, pardon the comparison, if I say that her effective clearing away of antiquated incumbrances from the lists of the controversy reminds me of nothing so much as of the action of some neat-handed, but strong-wristed, Phyllis, who, gracefully wielding her long-handled "Turk's head," sweeps away the accumulated results of the toil of generations of spiders. I am the more indebted to this luminous sketch of the results of critical investigation, as it is carried out among those theologians who are men of science and not mere counsel for creeds, since it has relieved me from the necessity of dealing with the greater part of Dr. Wace's polemic, and enables me to devote more space to the really important issues which have been raised.†

Perhaps, however, it may be well for me to observe that approbation of the manner in which a great biblical scholar, for instance Reuss, does his work does not commit me to the adoption of all, or indeed of any of his views; and further, that the disagreements of a series of investigators do not in any way interfere with the fact that each of them has made important contributions to the body of truth ultimately established. If I cite Buffon, Linnæus, Lamarck, and Cuvier, as having each and all taken a leading share in building up modern biology, the statement that every one of these great naturalists disagreed with, and even more or less contradicted, all the rest is quite true; but the supposition that the latter assertion is in any way inconsistent with the former, would betray a strange ignorance of the manner in which all true science advances.

---

* Page 88.

† I may, perhaps, return to the question of the authorship of the Gospels. For the present I must content myself with warning my readers against any reliance upon Dr. Wace's statements as to the results arrived at by modern criticism. They are as gravely as surprisingly erroneous.

Dr. Wace takes a great deal of trouble to make it appear that I have desired to evade the real questions raised by his attack upon me at the Church Congress. I assure the reverend principal that in this, as in some other respects, he has entertained a very erroneous conception of my intentions. Things would assume more accurate proportions in Dr. Wace's mind if he would kindly remember that it is just thirty years since ecclesiastical thunderbolts began to fly about my ears. I have had the "Lion and the Bear" to deal with, and it is long since I got quite used to the threatenings of episcopal Goliaths, whose crosiers were like unto a weaver's beam. So that I almost think I might not have noticed Dr. Wace's attack, personal as it was; and although, as he is good enough to tell us, separate copies are to be had for the modest equivalent of twopence, as a matter of fact, it did not come under my notice for a long time after it was made. May I further venture to point out that (reckoning postage) the expenditure of twopence-halfpenny, or, at the most, threepence, would have enabled Dr. Wace so far to comply with ordinary conventions as to direct my attention to the fact that he had attacked me before a meeting at which I was not present? I really am not responsible for the five months' neglect of which Dr. Wace complains. Singularly enough, the Englishry who swarmed about the Engadine, during the three months that I was being brought back to life by the glorious air and perfect comfort of the Maloja, did not, in my hearing, say anything about the important events which had taken place at the Church Congress; and I think I can venture to affirm that there was not a single copy of Dr. Wace's pamphlet in any of the hotel libraries which I rummaged in search of something more edifying than dull English or questionable French novels.

And now, having, as I hope, set myself right with the public as regards the sins of commission and omission with which I have been charged, I feel free to deal with matters to which time and type may be more profitably devoted.

The Bishop of Peterborough indulges in the anticipation that Dr. Wace will succeed in showing me "that a scientist dealing with questions of theology or biblical criticism may go quite as far astray as theologians often do in dealing with questions of science."[*] I have already admitted that vaticination is not in my line; and I cannot so much as hazard a guess whether the spirit of prophecy which has descended on the bishop comes from the one or the other of the two possible sources recognized by the highest authorities. But I think it desirable to warn those who may be misled by phraseology of this kind, that the antagonists in the present debate are not quite rightly represented by it. Undoubtedly, Dr. Wace is a theologian; and I should be the last person to question that his whole cast of thought and style of argumentation are pre-eminently and typically theological. And, if I must accept the hideous term "scientist" (to which I object even more than I do to "infidel"), I am ready to admit that I am one of the people so denoted.

But I hope and believe that there is not a solitary argument I have used, or that I am about to use, which is original, or has anything to do with the fact that I have been chiefly occupied with natural science. They are all, facts and reasoning alike, either identical with, or consequential upon, propositions which are to be found in the works of scholars and theologians of the highest repute in the only two countries, Holland and Germany,[†] in which, at the present time, professors of theology are to be found whose tenure of their posts does not depend upon the results to which their inquiries lead them.[‡]

---

[*] Page 90.

[†] The United States ought, perhaps, to be added, but I am not sure.

[‡] Imagine that all our chairs of Astronomy had been founded in the fourteenth century, and that their incumbents were bound to sign Ptolemaic articles. In that case, with every respect for the efforts of persons thus hampered to attain and expound the truth, I think men of common sense would go elsewhere to learn astronomy. Zeller's "Vorträge und Abhandlungen" were published and came into my hands a quarter of a century ago. The writer's rank, as a theologian to begin with, and subsequently as a historian of Greek philosophy, is of the highest. Among these essays are two—"Das Urchristenthum" and "Die Tübinger historische Schule"—which are likely to be of more use to those who wish to know the real state of the case than all that the official "apologists," with their one eye on truth and the other on the tenets of their sect, have written. For the opinion of a scientific theologian about theologians of this stamp, see pp. 225 and 227 of the "Vorträge."

It is true that, to the best of my ability, I have satisfied myself of the soundness of the foundations on which my arguments are built, and I desire to be held fully responsible for everything I say. But, nevertheless, my position is really no more than that of an expositor; and my justification for undertaking it is simply that conviction of the supremacy of private judgment (indeed, of the impossibility of escaping it) which is the foundation of the Protestant Reformation, and which was the doctrine accepted by the vast majority of the Anglicans of my youth, before that backsliding toward the "beggarly rudiments" of an effete and idolatrous sacerdotalism which has, even now, provided us with the saddest spectacle which has been offered to the eyes of Englishmen in this generation. A high court of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, with a host of great lawyers in battle array, is, and, for Heaven knows how long, will be occupied with these very questions of "washings of cups and pots and brazen vessels," which the Master, whose professed representatives are rending the Church over these squabbles, had in his mind when, as we are told, he uttered the scathing rebuke:

> Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written:
> This people honoreth me with their lips,
> But their heart is far from me:
> But in vain do they worship me,
> Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men (Mark vii. 6, 7).

Men who can be absorbed in bickerings over miserable disputes of this kind can have but little sympathy with the old evangelical doctrine of the "open Bible," or anything but a grave misgiving of the results of diligent reading of the Bible, without the help of ecclesiastical spectacles, by the mass of the people. Greatly to the surprise of many of my friends, I have always advocated the reading of the Bible, and the diffusion of the study of that most remarkable collection of books among the people. Its teachings are so infinitely superior to those of the sects, who are just as busy now as the Pharisees were eighteen hundred years ago, in smothering them under "the precepts of men;" it is so certain, to my mind, that the Bible contains within itself the refutation of nine tenths of the mixture of sophistical metaphysics and old-world superstition which has been piled round it by the so-called Christians of later times; it is so clear that the only immediate and ready antidote to the poison which has been mixed with Christianity, to the intoxication and delusion of mankind, lies in copious draughts from the undefiled spring, that I exercise the right and duty of free judgment on the part of every man, mainly for the purpose of inducing other laymen to follow my example. If the New Testament is translated into Zulu by Protestant missionaries, it must be assumed that a Zulu convert is competent to draw from its contents all the truths which it is necessary for him to believe. I trust that I may, without immodesty, claim to be put on the same footing as the Zulu.

The most constant reproach which is launched against persons of my way of thinking is, that it is all very well for us to talk about the deductions of scientific thought, but what are the poor and the uneducated to do? Has it ever occurred to those who talk in this fashion that the creeds and articles of their several confessions; their determination of the exact nature and extent of the teachings of Jesus; their expositions of the real meaning of that which is written in the Epistles (to leave aside all questions concerning the Old Testament) are nothing more than deductions, which, at any rate, profess to be the result of strictly scientific thinking, and which are not worth attending to unless they really possess that character? If it is not historically true that such and such things happened in Palestine eighteen centuries ago, what becomes of Christianity? And what is historical truth but that of which the evidence bears strict scientific investigation? I do not call to mind any problem of natural science which has come under my notice, which is more difficult, or more curiously interesting as a mere problem, than that of the origin of the synoptic Gospels and that of the historical value of the narratives which they contain. The Christianity of the churches stands or falls by the results of the purely scientific investigation of these questions. They were first taken up in a purely scientific spirit just about a century ago; they have been studied, over and over again, by men of vast knowledge and critical acumen; but he would be a rash man who should assert that any solution of these problems, as yet formulated, is exhaustive. The most that can be said is that certain prevalent solutions are certainly false, while others are more or less probably true.

If I am doing my best to rouse my countrymen out of their dogmatic slumbers, it is not that they may be amused by seeing who gets the best of it, in a contest between a "scientist" and a theologian. The serious question is whether theological men of science, or theological special pleaders, are to have the confidence of the general public; it is the question whether a country in which it is possible for a body of excellent clerical and lay gentlemen to discuss, in public meeting assembled, how much it is desirable to let the congregations of the faithful know of the results of biblical criticism, is likely to wake up with anything short of the grasp of a rough lay hand upon its shoulder; it is the question whether the New Testament books, being, as I believe they were, written and compiled by people who, according to their lights, were perfectly sincere, will not, when properly studied as ordinary historical documents, afford us the means of self-criticism. And it must be remembered that the New Testament books are not responsible for the doctrine invented by the churches that they are anything but ordinary historical documents. The author of the third Gospel tells us as straightforwardly as a man can that he has no claim to any other character than that of an ordinary compiler and editor, who had before him the works of many and variously qualified predecessors.

In my former papers, according to Dr. Wace, I have evaded giving an answer to his main proposition, which he states as follows:

> Apart from all disputed points of criticism, no one practically doubts that our Lord lived and that he died on the cross, in the most intense sense of filial relation to his Father in heaven, and that he bore testimony to that Father's providence, love, and grace toward mankind. The Lord's Prayer affords a sufficient evidence on these points. If the Sermon on the Mount alone be added, the whole unseen world, of which the agnostic refuses to know anything, stands unveiled before us. . . . If Jesus Christ preached that sermon, made those promises, and taught that prayer, then any one who says that we know nothing of God, or of a future life, or of an unseen world, says that he does not believe Jesus Christ.[*]

Again—

> The main question at issue, in a word, is one which Professor Huxley has chosen to leave entirely on one side—whether, namely, allowing for the utmost uncertainty on other points of the criticism to which he appeals, there is any reasonable doubt that the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount afford a true account of our Lord's essential belief and cardinal teaching.[†]

I certainly was not aware that I had evaded the questions here stated; indeed, I should say that I have indicated my reply to them pretty clearly; but, as Dr. Wace wants a plainer answer, he shall certainly be gratified. If, as Dr. Wace declares it is, his "whole case is involved in" the argument as stated in the latter of these two extracts, so much the worse for his whole case. For I am of opinion that there is the gravest reason for doubting whether the "Sermon on the Mount" was ever preached, and whether the so-called "Lord's Prayer" was ever prayed by Jesus of Nazareth. My reasons for this opinion are, among others, these: There is now no doubt that the three synoptic Gospels, so far from being the work of three independent writers, are closely interdependent,[*] and that in one of two ways. Either all three contain, as their foundation, versions, to a large extent verbally identical, of one and the same tradition; or two of them are thus closely dependent on the third; and the opinion of the majority of the best critics has, of late years, more and more converged toward the conviction that our canonical second Gospel (the so-called "Mark's" Gospel) is that which most closely represents the primitive groundwork of the three.[†] That I take to be one of the most valid results of New Testament criticism, of immeasurably greater importance than the discussion about dates and authorship.

But if, as I believe to be the case, beyond any rational doubt or dispute, the second Gospel is the nearest extant representative of the oldest tradition, whether written or oral, how comes it that it contains neither the "Sermon on the Mount" nor the "Lord's Prayer," those typical embodiments, according to Dr. Wace, of the "essential belief and cardinal teaching" of Jesus? Not only does "Mark's" Gospel fail to contain the "Sermon on the Mount," or anything but a very few of the sayings contained in that collection; but, at the point of the history of Jesus where the "Sermon" occurs in "Matthew," there is in "Mark" an apparently unbroken narrative, from the calling of James and John to the healing of Simon's wife's mother. Thus the oldest tradition not only ignores the "Sermon on the Mount," but, by implication, raises a probability against its being delivered when and where the later “Matthew” inserts it in his compilation.

---

[*] Page 63.

[†] Page 64.

[*] I suppose this is what Dr. Wace is thinking about when he says that I allege that there "is no visible escape" from the supposition of an "Ur-Marcus" (p. 82). That a "theologian of repute" should confound an indisputable fact with one of the modes of explaining that fact, is not so singular as those who are unaccustomed to the ways of theologians might imagine.

[†] Any examiner whose duty it has been to examine into a case of "copying" will be particularly well prepared to appreciate the force of the case stated in that most excellent little book, "The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels," by Dr. Abbott and Mr. Rushbrooke (Macmillan, 1884). To those who have not passed through such painful experiences I may recommend the brief discussion of the genuineness of the "Casket Letters" in my friend Mr. Skelton's interesting book, "Maitland of Lethington." The second edition of Holtzmann's "Lehrbuch," published in 1886, gives a remarkably fair and full account of the present results of criticism. At page 366 he writes that the present burning question is whether the "relatively primitive narration and the root of the other synoptic texts is contained in Matthew or in Mark. It is only on this point that properly informed (*sachkundige*) critics differ," and he decides in favor of Mark.

And still more weighty is the fact that the third Gospel, the author of which tells us that he wrote after “many” others had “taken in hand” the same enterprise; who should therefore have known the first Gospel (if it existed), and was bound to pay to it the deference due to the work of an apostolic eye-witness (if he had any reason for thinking it was so)—this writer, who exhibits far more literary competence than the other two, ignores any “Sermon on the Mount,” such as that reported by “Matthew,” just as much as the oldest authority does. Yet “Luke” has a great many passages identical, or parallel, with those in “Matthew's” “Sermon on the Mount,” which are, for the most part, scattered about in a totally different connection.

Interposed, however, between the nomination of the apostles and a visit to Capernaum; occupying, therefore, a place which answers to that of the “Sermon on the Mount” in the first Gospel, there is, in the third Gospel, a discourse which is as closely similar to the “Sermon on the Mount” in some particulars, as it is widely unlike it in others.

This discourse is said to have been delivered in a “plain” or “level place” (Luke vi. 17), and by way of distinction we may call it the “Sermon on the Plain.”

I see no reason to doubt that the two evangelists are dealing, to a considerable extent, with the same traditional material; and a comparison of the two “sermons” suggests very strongly that “Luke's” version is the earlier. The correspondences between the two forbid the notion that they are independent. They both begin with a series of blessings, some of which are almost verbally identical. In the middle of each (Luke vi. 27–38, Matthew v. 43–48) there is a striking exposition of the ethical spirit of the command given in Leviticus xix. 18. And each ends with a passage containing the declaration that a tree is to be known by its fruit, and the parable of the house built on the sand. But while there are only twenty-nine verses in the “Sermon on the Plain,” there are one hundred and seven in the “Sermon on the Mount;” the excess in length of the latter being chiefly due to the long interpolations, one of thirty verses before, and one of thirty-four verses after, the middlemost parallelism with Luke. Under these circumstances, it is quite impossible to admit that there is more probability that “Matthew's” version of the sermon is historically accurate than there is that Luke's version is so; and they cannot both be accurate.

“Luke” either knew the collection of loosely connected and aphoristic utterances which appear under the name of the “Sermon on the Mount” in “Matthew,” or he did not. If he did not, he must have been ignorant of the existence of such a document as our canonical “Matthew,” a fact which does not make for the genuineness or the authority of that book. If he did, he has shown that he does not care for its authority on a matter of fact of no small importance; and that does not permit us to conceive that he believed the first Gospel to be the work of an authority to whom he ought to defer, let alone that of an apostolic eye-witness.

The tradition of the Church about the second Gospel, which I believe to be quite worthless, but which is all the evidence there is for “Mark's” authorship, would have us believe that “Mark” was little more than the mouth-piece of the apostle Peter. Consequently, we are to suppose that Peter either did not know, or did not care very much for, that account of the “essential belief and cardinal teaching” of Jesus which is contained in the Sermon on the Mount; and, certainly, he could not have shared Dr. Wace's view of its importance.*

I thought that all fairly attentive and intelligent students of the Gospels, to say nothing of theologians of reputation, knew these things. But how can any one who does know them have the conscience to ask whether there is “any reasonable doubt” that the Sermon on the Mount was preached by Jesus of Nazareth? If conjecture is permissible, where nothing else is possible, the most probable conjecture seems to be that “Matthew,” having a *cento* of sayings attributed—rightly or wrongly it is impossible to say—to Jesus, among his materials, thought they were, or might be, records of a continuous discourse, and put them in at the place he thought likeliest. Ancient historians of the highest character saw no harm in composing long speeches which never were spoken, and putting them into the mouths of statesmen and warriors; and I presume that whoever is represented by “Matthew” would have been grievously astonished to find that any one objected to his following the example of the best models accessible to him.

---

* Holtzmann (“Die synoptischen Evangelien,” 1863, p. 75), following Ewald, argues that the “Source A” (= the threefold tradition, more or less) contained something that answered to the “Sermon on the Plain” immediately after the words of our present Mark, “And he cometh into a house” (iii. 19). But what conceivable motive could “Mark” have for omitting it? Holtzmann has no doubt, however, that the “Sermon on the Mount” is a compilation, or, as he calls it in his recently published “Lehrbuch” (p. 372), “an artificial mosaic work.”

So with the "Lord's Prayer." Absent in our representative of the oldest tradition, it appears in both "Matthew" and "Luke." There is reason to believe that every pious Jew, at the commencement of our era, prayed three times a day, according to a formula which is embodied in the present *Schmone-Esre*[*] of the Jewish prayer-book. Jesus, who was assuredly, in all respects, a pious Jew, whatever else he may have been, doubtless did the same. Whether he modified the current formula, or whether the so-called "Lord's Prayer" is the prayer substituted for the *Schmone-Esre* in the congregations of the Gentiles, who knew nothing of the Jewish practice, is a question which can hardly be answered.

In a subsequent passage of Dr. Wace's article[†] he adds to the list of the verities which he imagines to be unassailable, "The story of the Passion." I am not quite sure what he means by this—I am not aware that any one (with the exception of certain ancient heretics) has propounded doubts as to the reality of the crucifixion; and certainly I have no inclination to argue about the precise accuracy of every detail of that pathetic story of suffering and wrong. But, if Dr. Wace means, as I suppose he does, that that which, according to the orthodox view, happened after the crucifixion, and which is, in a dogmatic sense, the most important part of the story, is founded on solid historical proofs, I must beg leave to express a diametrically opposite conviction.

What do we find when the accounts of the events in question, contained in the three synoptic Gospels, are compared together? In the oldest, there is a simple, straightforward statement which, for anything that I have to urge to the contrary, may be exactly true. In the other two, there is, round this possible and probable nucleus, a mass of accretions of the most questionable character.

The cruelty of death by crucifixion depended very much upon its lingering character. If there were a support for the weight of the body, as not unfrequently was the case, the pain during the first hours of the infliction was not, necessarily, extreme; nor need any serious physical symptoms at once arise from the wounds made by the nails in the hands and feet, supposing they were nailed, which was not invariably the case. When exhaustion set in, and hunger, thirst, and nervous irritation had done their work, the agony of the sufferer must have been terrible; and the more terrible that, in the absence of any effectual disturbance of the machinery of physical life, it might be prolonged for many hours, or even days. Temperate, strong men, such as the ordinary Galilean peasants were, might live for several days on the cross. It is necessary to bear these facts in mind when we read the account contained in the fifteenth chapter of the second Gospel.

Jesus was crucified at the third hour (xv. 25), and the narrative seems to imply that he died immediately after the ninth hour (*v.* 34). In this case he would have been crucified only six hours; and the time spent on the cross cannot have been much longer, because Joseph of Arimathea must have gone to Pilate, made his preparations, and deposited the body in the rock-cut tomb before sunset, which, at that time of the year, was about the twelfth hour. That any one should die after only six hours' crucifixion could not have been at all in accordance with Pilate's large experience in the effects of that method of punishment. It, therefore, quite agrees with what might be expected if Pilate "marvelled if he were already dead," and required to be satisfied on this point by the testimony of the Roman officer who was in command of the execution party. Those who have paid attention to the extraordinarily difficult question, What are the indisputable signs of death?—will be able to estimate the value of the opinion of a rough soldier on such a subject; even if his report to the procurator were in no wise affected by the fact that the friend of Jesus, who anxiously awaited his answer, was a man of influence and of wealth.

The inanimate body, wrapped in linen, was deposited in a spacious,[*] cool, rock chamber, the entrance of which was closed, not by a well-fitting door, but by a stone rolled against the opening, which would of course allow free passage of air. A little more than thirty-six hours afterward (Friday 6 P.M., to Sunday 6 A.M., or a little after) three women visit the tomb and find it empty. And they are told by a young man "arrayed in a white robe" that Jesus is gone to his native country of Galilee, and that the disciples and Peter will find him there.

Thus it stands, plainly recorded, in the oldest tradition that, for any evidence to the contrary, the sepulchre may have been vacated at any time during the Friday or Saturday nights. If it is said that no Jew would have violated the Sabbath by taking the former course, it is to be recollected that Joseph of Arimathea might well be familiar with that wise and liberal interpretation of the fourth commandment, which permitted works of mercy to men—nay even the drawing of an ox or an ass out of a pit—on the Sabbath. At any rate, the Saturday night was free to the most scrupulous observers of the law.

---

[*] See Schürer, "Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes," Zweiter Theil, p. 384.

[†] Page 65.

[*] Spacious, because a young man could sit in it "on the right side" (xv. 5), and therefore with plenty of room to spare.

These are the facts of the case as stated by the oldest extant narrative of them. I do not see why any one should have a word to say against the inherent probability of that narrative; and, for my part, I am quite ready to accept it as an historical fact, that so much and no more is positively known of the end of Jesus of Nazareth. On what grounds can a reasonable man be asked to believe any more? So far as the narrative in the first Gospel, on the one hand, and those in the third Gospel and the Acts, on the other go beyond what is stated in the second Gospel, they are hopelessly discrepant with one another. And this is the more significant because the pregnant phrase "some doubted," in the first Gospel, is ignored in the third.

But it is said that we have the witness Paul speaking to us directly in the Epistles. There is little doubt that we have, and a very singular witness he is. According to his own showing, Paul, in the vigor of his manhood, with every means of becoming acquainted, at first hand, with the evidence of eye-witnesses, not merely refused to credit them, but "persecuted the church of God and made havoc of it." The reasoning of Stephen fell dead upon the acute intellect of this zealot for the traditions of his fathers: his eyes were blind to the ecstatic illumination of the martyr's countenance "as it had been the face of an angel;" and when, at the words "Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God," the murderous mob rushed upon and stoned the rapt disciple of Jesus, Paul ostentatiously made himself their official accomplice.

Yet this strange man, because he has a vision one day, at once, and with equally headlong zeal, flies to the opposite pole of opinion. And he is most careful to tell us that he abstained from any re-examination of the facts.

> Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia. (Galatians i. 16, 17.)

I do not presume to quarrel with Paul's procedure. If it satisfied him, that was his affair; and, if it satisfies any one else, I am not called upon to dispute the right of that person to be satisfied. But I certainly have the right to say that it would not satisfy me in like case; that I should be very much ashamed to pretend that it could, or ought to, satisfy me; and that I can entertain but a very low estimate of the value of the evidence of people who are to be satisfied in this fashion, when questions of objective fact, in which their faith is interested, are concerned. So that, when I am called upon to believe a great deal more than the oldest Gospel tells me about the final events of the history of Jesus on the authority of Paul (1 Corinthians xv. 5–8), I must pause. Did he think it, at any subsequent time, worth while "to confer with flesh and blood," or, in modern phrase, to re-examine the facts for himself? or was he ready to accept anything that fitted in with his preconceived ideas? Does he mean, when he speaks of all the appearances of Jesus after the crucifixion as if they were of the same kind, that they were all visions, like the manifestation to himself? And, finally, how is this account to be reconciled with those in the first and the third Gospels—which, as we have seen, disagree with one another?

Until these questions are satisfactorily answered, I am afraid that, so far as I am concerned, Paul's testimony cannot be seriously regarded, except as it may afford evidence of the state of traditional opinion at the time at which he wrote, say between 55 and 60 A.D.; that is, more than twenty years after the event; a period much more than sufficient for the development of any amount of mythology about matters of which nothing was really known. A few years later, among the contemporaries and neighbors of the Jews, and, if the most probable interpretation of the Apocalypse can be trusted, among the followers of Jesus also, it was fully believed, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, that the Emperor Nero was not really dead, but that he was hidden away somewhere in the East, and would speedily come again at the head of a great army, to be revenged upon his enemies.

Thus, I conceive that I have shown cause for the opinion that Dr. Wace's challenge touching the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, and the Passion, was more valorous than discreet. After all this discussion I am still at the agnostic point. Tell me, first, what Jesus can be proved to have been, said, and done, and I will tell you whether I believe him, or in him,[*] or not! As Dr. Wace admits that I have dissipated his lingering shade of unbelief about the bedevilment of the Gadarene pigs, he might have done something to help mine. Instead of that, he manifests a total want of conception of the nature of the obstacles which impede the conversion of his "infidels."

The truth I believe to be, that the difficulties in the way of arriving at a sure conclusion as to these matters, from the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, or any other data offered by the synoptic Gospels (and *a fortiori* from the fourth Gospel) are insuperable. Every one of these records is colored by the prepossessions of those among whom the primitive traditions arose and of those by whom they were collected and edited; and the difficulty of making allowance for these prepossessions is enhanced by our ignorance of the exact dates at which the documents were first put together; of the extent to which they have been subsequently worked over and interpolated; and of the historical sense, or want of sense, and the dogmatic tendencies, of their compilers and editors. Let us see if there is any other road which will take us into something better than negation.

There is a widespread notion that the "primitive Church," while under the guidance of the apostles and their immediate successors, was a sort of dogmatic dovecote, pervaded by the most loving unity and doctrinal harmony. Protestants, especially, are fond of attributing to themselves the merit of being nearer "the Church of the apostles" than their neighbors; and they are the less to be excused for their strange delusion because they are great readers of the documents which prove the exact contrary. The fact is that, in the course of the first three centuries of its existence, the Church rapidly underwent a process of evolution of the most remarkable character, the final stage of which is far more different from the first than Anglicanism is from Quakerism. The key to the comprehension of the problem of the origin of that which is now called "Christianity," and its relation to Jesus of Nazareth, lies here. Nor can we arrive at any sound conclusion as to what it is probable that Jesus actually said and did without being clear on this head. By far the most important and subsequently influential steps in the evolution of Christianity took place in the course of the century, more or less, which followed upon the crucifixion. It is almost the darkest period of Church history, but, most fortunately, the beginning and the end of the period are brightly illuminated by the contemporary evidence of two writers of whose historical existence there is no doubt,[*] and against the genuineness of whose most important works there is no widely admitted objection. These are Justin, the philosopher and martyr, and Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. I shall call upon these witnesses only to testify to the condition of opinion among those who called themselves disciples of Jesus in their time.

Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, which was written somewhere about the middle of the second century, enumerates certain categories of persons who, in his opinion, will, or will not, be saved.[†] These are:

1. Orthodox Jews who refuse to believe that Jesus is the Christ. *Not saved.*
2. Jews who observe the law; believe Jesus to be the Christ; but who insist on the observance of the law by Gentile converts. *Not saved.*
3. Jews who observe the law; believe Jesus to be the Christ, and hold that Gentile converts need not observe the law. *Saved* (in Justin's opinion; but some of his fellow-Christians think the contrary).
4. Gentile converts to the belief in Jesus as the Christ, who observe the law. *Saved* (possibly).
5. Gentile believers in Jesus as the Christ, who do not observe the law themselves (except so far as the refusal of idol sacrifices), but do not consider those who do observe it heretics. *Saved* (this is Justin's own view).
6. Gentile believers who do not observe the law except in refusing idol sacrifices, and hold those who do observe it to be heretics. *Saved.*
7. Gentiles who believe Jesus to be the Christ and call themselves Christians, but who eat meats sacrificed to idols. *Not saved.*
8. Gentiles who disbelieve in Jesus as the Christ. *Not saved.*

Justin does not consider Christians who believe in the natural birth of Jesus, of whom he implies that there is a respectable minority, to be heretics, though he himself strongly holds the preternatural birth of Jesus and his pre-existence as the "Logos" or "Word." He conceives the Logos to be a second God, inferior to the first, unknowable, God, with respect to whom Justin, like Philo, is a complete agnostic. The Holy Spirit is not regarded by Justin as a separate personality, and is often mixed up with the "Logos." The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul is, for Justin, a heresy; and he is as firm a believer in the resurrection of the body as in the speedy second coming and the establishment of the millennium.

---

[*] I am very sorry for the interpolated "in," because citation ought to be accurate in small things as in great. But what difference it makes whether one "believes Jesus" or "believes in Jesus" much thought has not enabled me to discover. If you "believe him" you must believe him to be what he professed to be—that is, "believe in him;" and if you "believe in him" you must necessarily "believe him."

[*] True for Justin; but there is a school of theological critics, who more or less question the historical reality of Paul and the genuineness of even the four cardinal epistles.

[†] See "Dial. cum Tryphone," sections 47 and 35. It is to be understood that Justin does not arrange these categories in order as I have done.

This pillar of the Church in the middle of the second century—a much-travelled native of Samaria—was certainly well acquainted with Rome, probably with Alexandria, and it is likely that he knew the state of opinion throughout the length and breadth of the Christian world as well as any man of his time. If the various categories above enumerated are arranged in a series thus—

		Justin's Christianity.					
Orthodox Judaism.	*Judæo-Christianity.*					*Idolothytic Christianity.*	*Paganism.*
I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII

it is obvious that they form a gradational series from orthodox Judaism, on the extreme left, to paganism, whether philosophic or popular, on the extreme right; and it will further be observed that, while Justin's conception of Christianity is very broad, he rigorously excludes two classes of persons who, in his time, called themselves Christians; namely, those who insist on circumcision and other observances of the law on the part of Gentile converts; that is to say, the strict Judæo-Christians (II), and on the other hand, those who assert the lawfulness of eating meat offered to idols—whether they are gnostics or not (VII). These last I have called "idolothytic" Christians, because I cannot devise a better name, not because it is strictly defensible etymologically.

At the present moment I do not suppose there is an English missionary in any heathen land who would trouble himself whether the materials of his dinner had been previously offered to idols or not. On the other hand, I suppose there is no Protestant sect within the pale of orthodoxy, to say nothing of the Roman and Greek Churches, which would hesitate to declare the practice of circumcision and the observance of the Jewish Sabbath and dietary rules, shockingly heretical.

Modern Christianity has, in fact, not only shifted far to the right of Justin's position, but it is of much narrower compass.

		Justin.					
	Judæo-Christianity.				*Modern Christianity.*		*Paganism.*
Judaism.							
I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII

For, though it includes VII, and even, in saint and relic worship, cuts a "monstrous cantel" out of paganism, it excludes, not only all Judæo-Christians, but all who doubt that such are heretics. Ever since the thirteenth century, the Inquisition would have cheerfully burned, and in Spain did abundantly burn, all persons who came under the categories II, III, IV, V. And the wolf would play the same havoc now if it could only get its blood-stained jaws free from the muzzle imposed by the secular arm.

Further, there is not a Protestant body except the Unitarian, which would not declare Justin himself a heretic, on account of his doctrine of the inferior godship of the Logos; while I am very much afraid that, in strict logic, Dr. Wace would be under the necessity, so painful to him, of calling him an "infidel," on the same and on other grounds.

Now let us turn to our other authority. If there is any result of critical investigations of the sources of Christianity which is certain,* it is that Paul of Tarsus wrote the Epistle to the Galatians somewhere between the years 55 and 60 A.D., that is to say, roughly, twenty, or five-and-twenty, years after the crucifixion. If this is so, the Epistle to the Galatians is one of the oldest, if not the very oldest, of extant documentary evidences of the state of the primitive Church. And, be it observed, if it is Paul's writing, it unquestionably furnishes us with the evidence of a participator in the transactions narrated. With the exception of two or three of the other Pauline epistles, there is not one solitary book in the New Testament of the authorship and authority of which we have such good evidence.

(To be continued.)

---

* I guard myself against being supposed to affirm that even the four cardinal epistles of Paul may not have been seriously tampered with. See note on page 396.

GOODLY WORDS.

Readings from the Mystics, selected by C. H. A. **Bjerregaard**, of the Astor Library.

"The only firm friend who follows men after death is justice; all others are extinct with the body. For in his passage to the next world, neither his father, nor his mother, nor his wife, nor his son, nor his kinsmen, will remain in his company—his virtue alone will adhere to him. Single is each man born; single he dies;* single he receives the reward of his good, and single the punishment of his evil deeds. When he leaves his corse, like a log or a lump of clay, on the ground, his kindred retire with averted faces; but his virtue accompanies his soul. Continually, therefore, by degrees, let him collect virtue, for the sake of securing an inseparable companion; since with virtue for his guide he will traverse a gloom, how hard to be traversed."

Manu law-book, viii. 17, and iv. 239–42, translated by *Sir W. Jones.*

"For piety dies with men; and whether they live or die, it does not perish."

Sophocles, *Philoctetes*, 1143.

"For our great Father counteth piety
Far above all. This follows men in death,
And failed not when they resign their breath."

The same, translated by Professor *Lewis Campbell.*

"But virtue does not perish even if a man dies, but lives, though the body no longer exists; but to the bad all things disappear, dying with them, beneath the earth."

Euripides, *Temenidæ* (Dindorf fragment 1).

"Zarathustra asked Ahura-Mazda: Ahura-Mazda, Heavenly, Holiest, Creator of the corporeal world, Pure! When a pure man dies, where does his soul dwell . . . .? When the lapse of the third night turns itself to light, then the soul of the pure man goes forward, re-collecting itself. . . . A wind blows to meet it from the mid-day region, from the mid-day regions, a sweet-scented one, more sweet-scented than the other winds. Then it goes forward, the soul of the pure man, receiving the wind in the nose (saying): Whence blows this wind, the sweetest-scented which I ever have smelt with the nose? In that wind there comes to meet him his own law† in the figure of a maiden, one beautiful, shining, with shining arms; one powerful, well-grown, slender, with large breasts, praiseworthy body; one noble, with brilliant face, one of fifteen years, as fair in her growth as the fairest creatures. Then to her (the maiden) speaks the soul of the pure man, asking: What maiden art thou whom I have seen here as the fairest of maidens in body? Then replies to him his own law: I am, O youth, thy good thoughts, words, and works, thy good law, the law of thine own body, which would be in reference to thee (like) in greatness, goodness, and beauty, sweet-smelling, victorious, harmless, as thou appearest to me. Thou art like me, O well-speaking, well-thinking, well-acting youth, devoted to the good law, so in greatness, goodness, and beauty as I appear to thee. . . . The soul of the pure man . . . takes the fourth step and arrives at the Eternal Lights. . . . Then speaks Ahura-Mazda: . . . bring him hither of the food of the full fatness, that is the food for the youth who thinks, speaks, and does good. . . . Zarathustra asked Ahura-Mazda: Ahura-Mazda, Heavenly, Holiest, Creator of the corporeal world, Pure! When a wicked one dies, where does the soul dwell? . . . When the lapse of the third night approaches toward light, O pure Zarathustra, then goes the soul of the wicked man to the impure place, re-collecting itself continually by the stench. To it comes a wind blowing from the North region, an evil-smelling one, more evil smelling than other winds. When the soul of the wicked man receives this wind into the nose it goes (saying): Whence comes this wind which I smell with the nose as the most evil-smelling wind? In that wind (the mss. omit these verses, which must, however, of course, have contained exactly the converse of the verses above. In the *Minokhired* the verses corresponding to this passage say that the soul of the wicked meets the ugliest and most hateful maiden that can be conceived, and on asking her who she is he is told that she is his own wicked deeds, etc.). . . . The fourth step takes the soul of the wicked man and arrives at the darkness without beginning. . . . Then speaks Anra-mainyu:* . . . bring hither food, poison, and mixed with poison, for that is the food for a youth who thinks, speaks, and does evil, belongs to the wicked law, after his death." . . .

Khorda-Avesta, 22d fragment, translated by *A. H. Bleeck*, Hertford, 1864.

O Rose! of the flowers, I ween, thou art fairest,
But thorny and worthless the stem that thou bearest,
Fleeting thy beauty, unlovely thy fruit;
World, I would liken thee unto the roses,
Sweet are thy flatteries, sad are their closes,
Virtue and goodness in thee have no root.

Red is the berry, O Rose! on thy bushes,
Harsh is its inside, though fairly it blushes;
So World, dost thou lure us and mock us with lies:
Outside thy seeming is gracious and sunny,
Outside thy greetings are sweet as the honey,
Bitter thy kernel;—O man, then be wise!

Unknown Mystic of 13. Cent. *Transl. in Christ. Singers of Germany.*

Beauty is but a vaine and doubtfull good,
A shining glosse, that vadeth sodainly,
A flower that dies, when first it gins to bud,
A brittle glasse, that's broken presently.
A doubtfull good, a glosse, a glasse, a flower,
Lost, vaded, broken, dead within an houre.

And as goods lost are seld or neuer found,
As vaded glosse no rubbing will refresh:
As flowers dead lie withered on the ground,
As broken glasse no symant can redresse:
So beauty blemisht once, foreuer lost,
In spite of phisicke, painting, paine and cost.

Shakespeare: *The Passionate Pilgrim XI.*

The tree, which is by nature bitter
Tho' you should plant it in the garden of Paradise,
And water it from the fountain of Eternity,
And spread about its roots the purest honey,
Would in the end betray its nature,
And would still produce bitter fruit.

* * * * * * *

That evil should proceed from an evil disposition is not wonderful,
For thou canst not wash out the darkness from the night.

From Firdusi's *satire upon the ungrateful Sultan Mahmud.*

---

* Pascal: Je mourrai seul.

† That is, the rule of life to which he has conformed.

* It is characteristic of Anra-mainyus and the Daevas to mock as well as to inflict torments.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Church in Modern Society. By Julius H. Ward. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, $1.

"This book is intended for the whole Christian family in this country." This is the sentence with which the author begins his preface, and it indicates sufficiently well the spirit and purpose of the work. It calls attention to some serious defects in modern Christianity that have arisen from the undue stress laid upon the development of the religious life of the individual and the neglect of the Christian Church as such. In the Middle Ages the individual was merged in the Church, which controlled and directed all educational, social, and ethical institutions. In Protestantism the Church is for the sake of the individual, and the Church has given over education, society, and institutions for the relief and reformation of men to the State or to associations of individuals. "The life of men has come to be so much outside of the ecclesiastical environment that the world has pushed the Church out of its old centre, and built up all sorts of organizations to do its work of reformation and renewal." Where there are national churches these can sum up and express the religious life of the nation, and can infuse all institutions in the nation with the spirit of Christianity; but "where there is no national church it is not easy to supply its place. Where the Church is not central in society, it is not at the point where it can do the most for the social and personal amelioration of the people." The difficulty with the religious life of America is that "there has been not only no national organization of religion, but most Christians have never thought or worked outside of the religious cliques in which they were brought up or in which they have found themselves."

We cannot have a national church in the United States. Our history forbids it. But the political institutions of the country suggest a remedy to the churches for many of the evils of the present situation. "The Church to-day in America no longer satisfies anybody who considers its possibilities and compares them with its performance." "The institutional conception of Christian society has been overlooked. Accordingly Christianity is what you see it almost everywhere in America—a movement bearing the character of a spent or a misapplied or an unwisely directed force. This religious body believes in the universality of the atonement; that organization holds to the speedy second coming of our Lord; one would put the stress of the true Church in the mode of baptism; another would find the centre of interest in an emotional experience called conversion; another would rest the salvation of men upon the acceptance of the perfect humanity of the historical Christ; another would exalt Luther's dogma of justification by faith to the central place in the Christian system; still another would throw away the entire Christian Church and begin anew with the teachings of Swedenborg. There is no unity of the Christian religion in these discordant systems, nothing which raises the enthusiasm of humanity, nothing which heartens one to believe in Christianity itself." The great need of our times is an inclusive church, an idealized church, one that will grasp the interests of humanity and comprehend all the varied interests that are now so zealously contended for in different organization. Mr. Ward is entirely correct. Protestant churches have gone on excluding men from their organization on account of differences in dogma, in polity, and in theories of worship. The terms were so exclusive in the eighteenth century that a large proportion of the Christian population of Great Britain and America were not in communion with visible churches. The state of affairs is so bad at present that one of the brightest theologians of Scotland has said, within the present year, "I am even disposed to think that a great and steadily increasing portion of the moral worth of society lies outside of the Church, separated from it not by godlessness, but rather by exceptionally intense moral earnestness. Many, in fact, have left the Church in order to be Christians." The Church in our time has a high calling to evangelize the heathen world, to reform the depraved, to educate the ignorant, to raise up the fallen, to reform society, to ennoble honest, faithful labor, to sanctify the family, and to make the school and the State truly Christian. It is impossible to accomplish these great results by a host of heterogeneous, jarring sects that expend a large portion of their energy in friction with each other. There must be some kind of an organization of the Christian material. The army of the Lord, now in scattered battalions, like an army in retreat, should be organized for an aggressive campaign. How shall this be accomplished? Not by neglecting the liberty and experience of the individual, but by attending to the all-important interests of the Christian Church as such.

To this problem the author directs his attention in the two closing chapters of his book, on "Constructive Unity in Religious Forces" and "Unity through Working Agreements."

In the first of these chapters the author argues for federation of the churches, and in the second for ethical and spiritual unity. The principle of federation we learn from the history of our Federal Government. Many minds are tending in that direction at the present time. This is the method that I proposed several years ago in the *Presbyterian Review* and in my recent book, "Whither?" Mr. Ward kindly notices my book, but overlooks the fact that I had proposed federation, and that we are both working for the same great end. It is entirely practicable to combine the churches of the United States in a federation that will give visible expression to Christian unity, and that will give unity to many sections of Christian work. It is a very significant sign of the times that many minds in the Roman Catholic Church are moving in the same direction. It is through some such federation of the churches that the disturbing question of religion in the common schools may be settled, the great works of Christian charity may be more efficiently conducted, the reform of social and family life may be advanced, and the evangelization of the heathen world accomplished.

This book of Mr. Ward is well worthy of the attention of all thinking religious people.

NEW YORK. C. A. BRIGGS.

THE UNKNOWN GOD, OR INSPIRATION AMONG PRE-CHRISTIAN RACES. By C. LORING BRACE. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890. 8vo, $2.50.

In an age of a degrading materialism, in a land where it is reported that forty millions of people worship no God whatever, a book on Religion ought to be hailed with thankfulness. Mr. Brace presents us with a volume which teaches that man has nobler powers than those by which he eats and drinks and makes money. Its title, "The Unknown God," is taken from the speech of Paul at Athens. By quotations from inscriptions, many of them newly discovered, and from ancient records, Mr. Brace shows that the ancient Egyptians, the Accadians, the Greeks, the Parsees, the Hindus, the Buddhists, all acknowledged the one Supreme God; that they worshipped Him, sought of Him the forgiveness of sins, and recognized the truth, that only by union with Him could rest be obtained by the immortal soul. The translations are affected by Scripture influences—this is not uncommon in books of this kind. Many were astonished when Arnold's "Light of Asia" appeared, at its resemblance to the gospels; but upon investigation it is easily seen that he had presented Buddhism to us clad in the borrowed garments of Christianity. Mr. Brace seems to be anxious to set forth ancient heathenism in its strongest resemblances to our own religion, and these resemblances are indeed striking. That the ancients had a knowledge of the Supreme God is indisputable and is a fact borne out by our Scriptures. It is certain that after the flood Noah adored the true God, and his sons, who divided the earth, must have understood the character of his worship. The Hebrew name of Egypt is Misraim, who was a son or grandson of Ham. In the days of Abraham we find Melchisedec, priest of the Most High God. The Prophet Isaiah writes, "Hath it not been told you *from the beginning* that the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, faintest not?" In the ancient book of Job but the one eternal God is found. The Apostle Paul asserts of the heathen that "When *they knew God* they glorified Him not as God," and elsewhere he clearly teaches that not only by original tradition, but that by the things that are made, are clearly seen the eternal power and Godhead; moreover, that the law of God is written in every man's heart, and that in every one is a conscience which approves or condemns the actions of life. Mr. Brace does not formally state, but he implies the existence of the rudiments of religion in the soul of man. Theodore Parker reduces these to two—dependence and reverence. But this analysis is defective. Accountability and aspiration are as certainly found in the soul as are dependence and reverence. Back of all forms, even of Christianity, there lie these indestructible rudiments, so that the men who live—as do the majority in this land—without gratitude or adoration are silencing the voices of their own nature. Thus far we can go heartily with our author. But when he claims for the heathen "inspiration," he uses language which will not bear investigation. He confounds the mere suggestions of the mind with divine inspiration. This use of the word is common, as we say a man is inspired to write a poem, to state an argument, to attack an enemy, to paint a picture. That these suggestions in the old religions and philosophies were not divine inspirations is clear from the fact that they contradict each other. The inspiration of Epicurus was antagonistic to that of Socrates, the inspiration of

Zeno to that of Plato. In fact, under these inspirations the world was plunged into endless conjectures and unsettled controversies. We cannot go back to heathenism for our religion any more than we can go back to the deductions of the Middle Ages for our science. Heathenism has had its day; for thousands of years it possessed the world, and we are able to sum up its results in the very quotations of Mr. Brace. These results already begin to appear, and we have only to look at the inscriptions of the Assyrians, or the Accadians, or to the translated Vedas to see the aberrations of the heathen in two directions: First, in relegating the Supreme God to the unapproachable realms, so that He is called the *Unnameable* in the very Book of the Dead from which our author quotes; and second, to the representation of Him in polytheistic forms—that is, the worship of nature, hence the prayers to the sun, etc. The result of heathenism in religion has been agnosticism and polytheism; in morals, an utter chaos, a descent toward cruelty and obscenity. As the Scripture says, "The dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty." In no nations did it bring deliverance. The world had the truth, and the world apostatized from God. No one can fail to see the striking contrast between our Bible and the best of the heathen Scriptures. From the Rig Veda down to the Puranas, what a descent from highest thoughts to the most contemptible fables. In the Bible, which embodies our religion, we have from the beginning sublimest revelations of God, and perhaps there is nowhere a grander utterance in human language than the first sentence of the Scripture, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and yet in its whole course battling against the opposition of men, it advances toward the spiritual and the eternal. Spread out before us in history and prophecy are the three great conflicts, prolonged through thousands of years: First, Jehovah against idolatry, with its corruptions, that is, self-worship; second, against self-righteousness; and third, against selfishness itself. This is the last battle, and when this abomination is overthrown, then the kingdom of God will have come. Noteworthy it is that while the higher teachings of the old religions were confined to the priests, who desired in this way to defend their prerogatives, the Bible was from the beginning a people's book. Read it, said God, in the ears of the people. The great Jehovah who inhabits eternity makes Himself known to the humblest man. He is the God of the Lazarus at the rich man's gate, and, moreover, we must never forget that the Bible is authoritative. There is no suggestion to any human mind which, against the assertions of all the philosophies in the world, can prove that God *created* all things. While we admit that heathenism had its beauties and its excellences, in the light of the glory of our Christianity we cannot return to it for guidance. We must not be led astray by fancied resemblances. Students of logic will remember the old *fallacia accidentis*, in which an accidental resemblance is made to include substantial identity. Odin is called the All-Father, but Odin is not God—far enough from Him. Zeus may have certain attributes, but he is not God, neither is the Buthos of the Gnostics, nor the Brahm of the Hindus, nor the *το ον* of the Greeks. Christianity is exclusive; it knows of but one God, the God of holiness, and but one way of access to Him; but one Sacrifice for sin, and but one Holy Spirit, who regenerates and sanctifies the heart. Its demands are peremptory. On the side of man, the human conscience imperatively demands an explanation of sin, of misery and of death, and of the looking for of judgment. The question will not down, "How shall man be just with God?" The answer of Christ is, "This is My blood, shed for the remission of sins." "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me."

S. M. WOODBRIDGE.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

PALESTINE. By MAJOR C. R. CONDER. Great Explorers. Dodd, Mead & Company. New York. 1 vol. [Neither title-page nor preface is dated.] 12mo, $1.25.

From the title of this book one is led to suppose that he has in hand a history of Palestinean exploration. In this great work, which has been going on for half a century or more, representatives of many countries have borne an honorable part, and a volume containing the combined results, giving due credit to each explorer, whether of English, American, French, German, Italian, Swedish, or other nationality, tracing the various steps by which important identifications have been arrived at—such a volume would be most useful. This, however, is not the character of the present volume. On the contrary, it is confined almost exclusively to what Conder himself has done. If the reader once understands this and proceeds accordingly, he will not be disappointed that this book is only a flattering account of the Major's personal work. Such being the case, the sub-title, "Great Explorers," is puzzling.

The book contains eight essays, which have the character of ordinary magazine articles, and are hardly worthy of taking a place in permanent history. They are respectively Introductory, Judea, Samaria, Galilee, Moab, Gilead, Northern Syria, and Results of Exploration. The series of historical maps are very useful, but the illustrations are distressingly poor, apparently the most hasty kind of pencil sketches, introduced without change. It is a fair criticism that the work contains too much ancient history—out of the line of the explorer. For example, the chapter entitled "Northern Syria" (pp. 190–213) is wholly of this character, and might have been written by any intelligent traveller, or even by an intelligent person who had never seen the country. The same remark applies to other parts of the volume, such as the long account (pp. 117–27) of the characteristics of certain Mohammedan religious sects, which have been treated by competent scholars in a far more satisfactory way, and the general discussion (pp. 142–56) of stone monuments, examples of some of which occur east of the Jordan. These matters detract from the usefulness of the book as a history of Conder's explorations.

To err is human, hence it is no slander to say that Major Conder shares in this universal weakness. His statement that "the total length of the Jordan Valley from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea is about a hundred miles" (p. 72) I look upon as an oversight, for he certainly knows that the distance is only sixty-five miles. The statement that Wilson (now Sir Charles) determined accurately the level of the Dead Sea as being twelve hundred and ninety-two feet below the Mediterranean is misleading. Another person may be as exact in his work as Wilson was and arrive at twelve hundred and ninety-eight, thirteen hundred, or thirteen hundred and six as a result. The reason is that the difference in the level of the Dead Sea between summer and winter amounts to fifteen feet, and this fact, which Conder himself states, should not be overlooked whenever this subject is mentioned. The celebrated name Jotapata is spelled Gotapata (p. 102). As this spelling occurs twice, and again on the map, it can hardly be a slip. With the same propriety Joppa and Jerusalem, since each begins with the same letter, might be spelled as he has spelled Jotapata. That the walls of the Mosque enclosure at Hebron "are exactly like those of the Jerusalem Haram" (p. 33) is contrary to fact. They correspond to those in the palace of Hyrcanus at Arak El Emir east of the Jordan, which is one hundred and sixty years earlier than the Herodian work at Jerusalem. That the Hebron work "must be that of Herod the Great or of one of his immediate successors" is very improbable. The manner in which Josephus speaks of these monuments leads to the supposition that they were erected long before Herod's time.

In certain cases Conder does not appear to have availed himself of the latest information. For instance, he says that Schumacher "discovered the dolmens east of the Sea of Galilee," when they were visited and described by other travellers before Schumacher entered that country (pp. 20, 188). Again the great *wady,* represented on his map as coming from the northeast and entering the Jabbok near where that river bends to the west, does not exist. This appears upon some Sunday-school maps, and ought to be corrected. With regard to Siaghah, first mentioned by De Saulcey and since by many others, Dr. George E. Post, of Beirut, has shown that this name has no connection whatever with Pisgah, although the contrary has been vehemently asserted (p. 159). Further, as to the inscriptions at Jerash, if Conder would take the trouble to look in the *American Journal of Philology,* Vols. III. and VI., 1882 and 1885, he might learn something to his advantage and by which his own statements might be improved (p. 180). Particularly is this neglect of the literature of the subject evident in his claim to be the discoverer of Golgotha. In this he is positively mistaken. In attributing (p. 30) the discovery of the "second wall" to Mr. Schick he is certainly wrong. That wall the present writer found, explained what it was and its probable course, showed that it could not have been a tower, as was urged, and published accounts of it in England and America before any one else. This is a historical fact which only wilfulness or ignorance will dispute. On three stones which exist east of the Jordan he bases a special class of monuments, whose age and use are unknown, which he calls "*disc stones.*" One "stands up like a wheel," one "stands on end" (!), and the third "lies flat like a mighty cheese" (p. 154). These, however, are simply large millstones and nothing else. This is not a matter of opinion, but of fact. Conder's peculiar theory of the Hittites, especially of their language, has never been accepted by American scholars, but in this volume he states them with less positiveness than he has done in former publications.

The last chapter in the book on "The Results of Exploration" is by far the most valuable, giving as it does an outline of the "geological, geographical, physical, antiquarian, ethnical, and biblical" gains secured by the recent work of exploration. It is too brief, and has an apologetic tone, as though the author were defending himself or his society against certain criticisms that seem to him unfair. For the general reader it will be suggestive and helpful. His praise of the brilliant, poetical, and unreliable Renan is unexpected, coming as it does from an explorer who is supposed to deal in a matter-of-fact way with exact measurements and accurate details (p. 237). The Palestine Pilgrim's Text Society, which is translating and publishing some of the early travels in the Holy Land, is doing an excellent work, to which Conder gives special praise in his introductory chapter. The Palestine Exploration Fund, under whose auspices Major Conder labored, deserves the gratitude of the Christian world for the task which, nearly thirty years ago, it undertook and for the results which it has accomplished. Serious obstacles have been encountered, arising from the climate, the fanaticism of the people, and the opposition of the government. At last, by direct orders from Constantinople, the work was stopped. With all the advantages at his command Conder ought to produce superior work—work that by carefulness, scholarship, and judicious suggestions would commend itself to the judgment of those who, upon such matters, are best informed.

SELAH MERRILL.

ANDOVER, MASS.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By the late Rev. WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX, M.A. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 16mo, pp. xii., 226. 75 cents.

Clearly the last word has not been said on the grammar of the New Testament. The extensive works of Winer and Buttmann and the excellent grammar of S. G. Green still do duty in the study and the classroom. But they are not infallible. Their statements are challenged and corrected in our periodicals, and the way is being cleared for some work which shall supersede them because it will be better than they are. Mr. Simcox's book will not do this, though it may contribute to that end.

When the man whose grammar shall take the place of Winer and Buttmann in the study and the lecture-room gathers up the fragments from numerous sources with which to piece out and supplement his own researches, he can by no means neglect the neat little work before us, almost every page of which bears the marks of independent and painstaking study, and of excellent judgment. The author disclaims, however, any intention of making a "complete grammar of New Testament Greek." His chief aim was "to indicate . . . the points wherein the language of the New Testament differs from classical and even post-classical usage: to classify such differences according to their origin: and thus to vivify the study of purely verbal grammar, . . ." His aim is, therefore, a limited, though a useful one. A grammar to accomplish that was needed.

Not a few students of theology and even clergymen would find it hard to indicate the points wherein New Testament Greek agrees with and differs from classical Greek, and yet a clear understanding of the New Testament demands exact knowledge of this. In working out, as far as he has done, this line of investigation, Mr. Simcox has added to our knowledge.

In the introduction he has stated succinctly the conditions under which Greek gained its position as the medium of commercial intercourse, tracing briefly the "transformation" from the Attic to the Alexandrian and Hellenistic varieties. The first chapter deals with Hellenistic Greek, and is perhaps less happy, certainly more open to question in its conclusions, than the introduction. Mr. Simcox devotes but little space to what the grammars call etymology, twenty-two pages covering all he has to say on conjugation and declension. But these pages are valuable, one suggestion worthy of notice being a derivation of the genitive of first declension nouns in — ᾶ from an Hellenic source, another finding warrant in Plato for the employment of indeclinable foreign names. Throughout the book, however, analogy holds a large place—an uncertain argument in grammar, and one often unsatisfactory.

The bulk of the book (one hundred and sixty pages) is devoted to syntax, and here is shown the most painstaking study of the text of the New Testament, with perhaps (considering the size of the book) too minute attention to variant readings. The treatment would have gained in clearness had the text now so nearly universally accepted (Westcott and Hort's) been made the basis, with less reference to the MSS. Often readings with slight warrant are allowed extended comment.

The discussion of the tenses is spirited and original. But the author has taken much care to treat of the difference between aorist and perfect, noting the tendency of late Greek to eliminate that difference and use the tenses as equivalents. But a question much more important has all but escaped notice—the relation of the aorist and imperfect. Perfects are comparatively infrequent in the New Testament, aorists and imperfects abound on every page. The author, in treating of participle, might have done well to use Professor Ballantine's article in the *Bib. Sac.* for October, 1884.

The general excellence of the section treating of the moods leads us to regret that so little space is allowed the hypothetical period.

In connection with the prepositions no notice is taken of *μέχρι*, and especially remarkable is the omission of ἕως. The disregard of the latter is a grave omission when the scope of the work is considered. Out of about one hundred and forty cases of its occurrence in the New Testament about eighty are followed by the genitive, and this degeneration of ἕως from an adverb to a preposition is a marked feature of the "transformation" of the Attic into Alexandrian and Hellenistic Greek.

The index of Scripture passages is full, but unfortunately it is the only one. Not a great deal of help is to be gained in this direction from the table of contents, which is very meagre. With an index of Greek words explained and referred to, and a reasonably complete one of subjects, the volume, reasonable in price as it is, would be very valuable, might indeed become a pastor's study-table book. Lacking these indexes, its usefulness is much circumscribed.

Printed as it is in compact text, with no clear paragraphic divisions, it will hardly become a text-book in the class-room. Its make-up in this respect marks the author as a pastor, not a teacher. Valuable in the extreme to the author of a grammar is experience in the teacher's chair. There is a wide difference, for instance, between Professor Ballantine's terse statement of the usage of the New Testament of aorist participles (see *Bib. Sac.*, October, 1884) and the discussion of our author (pp. 122–35). Discussion is not all that is required in a grammar. Clear statement of principles is a *sine qua non.*

The author has enriched the volume by comparison with modern Greek, but why overleap patristic Greek to find illustrations in Romaic? Much more notice might have been taken of the Septuagint than has been done; still less should the Apocrypha—a most important link in the chain of descent—have been overlooked. Both these are now demanding much study and giving much light.

The book as a whole is so good, the discussion often so discriminating, that the few defects stand out in bold relief. The printing is neat, and but few typographical errors were noted. The writing of the word "Josepus" savors a little of pedantry. What need was there to depart from the ordinary form, "Josephus"? A business man would object to the numerous unexplained abbreviations—*e.g.*, "ptcp.," "v. l.," "pr. nn.," "s. vv.," etc. (see pp. 28, 31, 45, 66, etc.). George W. Gilmore.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mito Yashiki. A tale of old Japan. Being a feudal romance descriptive of the decline of the Shogunate and of the downfall of the power of the Tokugawa family. By Arthur Collins Maclay, A.M., LL.B. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 12mo, pp. viii., 456. Cloth, $1.50.

In this volume Mr. Maclay has made a new departure in the field of fiction. In reading the book, whose title indicates its contents in a general way, one has to cast aside the current significance of the word "romance." With its "Japanesque" coloring and motives the American and English romance has little in common. The story told in these pages is very fascinating and is well told, but aside from that one gains glimpses into the life of the country, its customs and some of its old institutions, which are extremely interesting. The account of the culmination of the power of the Shogun, the real ruler, and his downfall, followed by the revival of the power of the Mikado, are set forth upon a framework of fact, though clothed in the form of fiction. The main trouble is that these two elements are so woven together that one is often at a loss to distinguish and separate them.

To those interested in Christian Missions in Japan there are two chapters in particular which call for attention. The first, entitled "A Metaphysical Siesta," represents a discussion of some fundamental problems of Natural Theology between the Gotairo, or executive of the Shogun, and a Buddhist priest, in which the author causes the latter to abandon, one after the other, the tenets of his faith as commonly accepted, in a remarkable way. The second is near the close of the book, Chapter XXXV. This gives an account of a supposed conversation between two of the characters of the story and a Christian missionary as to some of the fundamental points of the Christian religion, which are represented as being of special importance in the eyes of cultured Japanese. There are three of these—the existence of God, Incarnation, and the Immortality of the Soul. The Atonement offered no insuperable difficulty or incomprehensible doctrine, inasmuch as it finds a parallel in a certain practice of feudal Japan.

Another passage is of interest, pages 422–425, as being the witness of one who has lived on the spot, to the value of Christian Missions.

By way of criticism two things may be suggested : First, the use of certain phrases which savor of current slang and which now disfigure the book in half-a-dozen places. These should be eliminated. Second, the use of native words of which no explanation is given. A vocabulary of these appended to the book, with proper explanation of their significance, would be of considerable service, and as the book treats of subjects not familiar to a large proportion of its readers, there would be no impropriety in it in connection with a romance.

C. R. GILLETT.

NEW YORK.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Account of Missionary Success in the Island of Formosa, Published in London in 1650, and now reprinted with appendix by W. Campbell. 2 vols. London : Trübner, 1889. 8vo. 10s.

Ahnne, L. Le livre de l'Ecclésiaste. Thèse. Toulouse : Chauvin, 1889. Pp. 50, 8vo.

Alexander, Archibald. A Theory of Conduct. New York : Scribner, 1890. Pp. iii., 111, 16mo, cloth, $1.

Ansault. Le culte de la croix avant Jésus-Christ. I.: La croix avant Jésus-Christ. Paris : Soye, 1889. Pp. 51, avec grav., 8vo.

Bachmann, Johan. Praeparationen zu den Kleinen Propheten. 1. Heft : Der Prophet Joel. Berlin : Mayer & Müller. Pp. vi., 16, 8vo, 50 pf.

Barth, Samuel. Die Mägde in der Bibel. Zehn Betrachtungen. Basel : Spittler, 1889. Pp. 95, 12mo, 50 pf.

Beissel, S. Geschichte der Trierer Kirchen, ihrer Reliquien und Kunstschätze. 2. Thl.: Geschichte des heiligen Rockes. 2. Aufl. Trier : Paulinus, 1889. Pp. 398, 8vo, illust., 4.50 mk.

Benoit, D. Les frères Gibert. Deux pasteurs du désert et du refuge (1722–1817). Toulouse : Lagarde, 1889. Portrait. Pp. 429, 12mo, 2.25 fr.

Boardman, George Dana. The Ten Commandments. A course of lectures delivered before the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia : American Baptist Publication Society (1889). Pp. 378, 12mo, $1.50.

Boardman, George Dana. The Divine Man, from the Nativity to the Temptation. New York : Appleton, 1888. Pp. 306, 12mo, $1.50.

Bonar, Horatius, D.D. : A Memorial. New York : Carter, 1889. Pp. ii., 116, 12mo, $1.

Bridgett, T. E., Rev., and **Knox,** T. F., Rev. The True Story of the Catholic Hierarchy Deposed by Queen Elizabeth, with Fuller Memoirs of its Last Two Survivors. New York : Catholic Publication Society, 1890. 8vo, $2.00.

Brooks, Walter R. God in Nature and Life : Selections from the Sermons and Writings of—. New York : Randolph [1889]. Pp. iii., 290, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Brucker, P. P. L'Alsace et l'église au temps du pape St. Léon IX. (Bruno d'Egisheim), 1002-1054 Tome II. Strassburg : Le Roux, 1889. Pp. 447, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Buck, J. D. The Nature and Aim of Theosophy : an Essay. 2d enlarged edition. Cincinnati : Clark, 1889. Pp. iv., 55, 12mo, 75 cts.

Buell, Samuel, D.D. A Treatise of Dogmatic Theology. 2 vols. New York : Whittaker, 1890, pp. 1227, 8vo, $6.00.

Bugge, F. W. Lukas-Evangeliet. Indledet, oversat og forklaret. Kristiania : Steen, 1889. Pp. x., 642, 8vo, 7kr.50.

Bunyon, Charles J. Memoirs of Francis Thomas McDougall, sometime Bishop of Labuan and Sarawak, and of Harriette, his Wife. New York : Longmans, 1890. Pp. 368, 8vo, $4.50.

Burge, Lorenzo. Origin and Formation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Boston : Lee & Shepard, 1890. Pp. v., 132, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Burns, D. Temperance History : A Consecutive Narrative of the Rise, Development and Extension of the Temperance Reform, with an introductory chapter. London : National Temperance Depot. Pp. 464, 8vo, 5s.

Cabrol, F. Le Cardinal Pitra, ses travaux et ses découvertes. Paris : Impr. Levé, 1889. Pp. 30, 8vo.

Campbell, James M. Unto the Uttermost. New York : Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1889. Pp. 254, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Clark, Rufus W., Rev. (St. Paul's, Detroit). The Church in thy House. Daily family prayers for morning and evening. New York : Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 120, 12mo.

Comba, E. Henri Arnaud, sa vie et ses lettres. Avec gravures et facsimilé. La Tour, 1889. Pp. 80, 8vo, 1 mk.

Contemporary Pulpit. Second Series. Vol. II., July–December, 1889. London : Sonnenschein. Pp. 378, post 8vo, 6s.

Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum. . .Pars II. Inscriptiones aramaicas continens Tomus I., Fasc. I. Paris : Impr. Nationale, 1889. Pp. vii., 173, 4to et atlas (19 pl.) in folio, 50 fr.

Crosby, Howard. The good and evil of Calvinism. New York : Randolph. Pp. ii., 23, 16mo, paper, 10 cts.

Demarest, D. D., Prof. Notes on Dort and Westminster. (New Brunswick Seminary Publications, No. 3.) New York : Board Publication Reformed Church. Pp. 30, 16mo, paper.

Diggle, John W. The Lancashire Life of Bishop Fraser. London : Low. 8vo, illustrated, 12s. 6d.

Driver, S. R. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. 8vo, cloth, 14s.

Eckhart, Meister. Ausgewählte Predigten und verwandte Schriftstücke. Mit einer einleitenden Monographie von W. Schöpff. (Die Predigt der Kirche, Band 8.) Leipzig : Richter, 1889. Pp. xvii., 136, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Ellis, James J., Rev. John Williams, the Martyr Missionary of Polynesia. New York and Chicago : Revell, 1890. Pp. 160, 12mo, 75 cts.

Fargues, P. La rédemption, d'après M. Secrétan. Thèse. Montauban : Granié, 1889. Pp. 88, 8vo.

Felix, Ludwig. Der Einfluss der Religion auf die Entwicklung des Eigenthums. Leipzig : Duncker & Humblot, 1889. Pp. ix., 388, 8vo, 8 mk.

Flour, C. Étude historique sur l'arminianisme. Thèse. Nimes : Chastanier. Pp. 119, 8vo.

Forrester, Henry. Christian Unity and the Historic Episcopate. By —, a Presbyter of the American Church. New York : Whittaker, 1889. Pp. 86, 8vo, cloth.

Franz, A. Das Judentum und sein Verhältnis zu anderen Religionen. Nach christlichen und jüdischen Quellen bearbeitet. 2. Aufl. Stuttgart: Pfautsch, 1890. Pp. v., 136, 8vo, 2 mk.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1628–1660. Selected and edited, with an historical introduction. London: Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan. Crown 8vo, cloth, 9s.

Godet, F. Studies on the Epistles. Translated by A. H. Holmden. London: Hodder, 1889. Pp. 358, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Göttsching, Joh. Apollonius von Tyana. Inaugural-Dissertation, Berlin. Leipzig: Fock, 1889. Pp. 126, 8vo, 2 mk.

Goodwin, Harvey, D.D., Ld.-Bp. of Carlisle. The Foundations of the Creed. Being a discussion of the grounds upon which the Articles of the Apostles' Creed may be held by earnest and thoughtful minds in the nineteenth century. London: Murray. 8vo, 14s.

Gordon, A. J., D.D. Ecce venit. Behold, he cometh. New York and Chicago: Revell. Pp. vii., 311, 12mo, $1.50.

Gregorovius, Ferdinand. Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter. Von der Zeit Justinian's bis zur türkischen Eroberung. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1889. 2 vols. Pp. xxii., 490; x., 477, 8vo, 20 mk.

Hammond, J. Church or Chapel: An Eirenicon. London: Wells Gardner. Pp. 368, 8vo, 5s.

Hans, Jul. Der protestantische Kultus. Augsburg: Schlosser, 1890. Pp. iii., 140, 8vo, 2 mk.

Hartmann, Ed. v. Ergänzungsband zur 1. bis 9. Aufl. der Philosophie des Unbewussten. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1889. Pp. xxxvi., 539, 8vo, 8 mk.

Herrmann, W. Der evangelische Glaube und die Theologie A. Ritschls. Rektoratsrede. Marburg: Elwert, 1890. Pp. 31, 8vo, 60 pf.

Hodges, George, Rev. Beside the Cross: Good Friday Meditations; with the Story of the Passion in the Words of Holy Scripture. By Rev. Laurens McLure. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. iii., 92, 12mo, 50 cts.

Hoerning, Reinhart, Ph.D. British Museum Karaite MSS. Descriptions and collation of six Karaite manuscripts of portions of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic characters; with a complete reproduction by the autotype process of one, Exodus i. 1-viii. 5, in 42 facsimiles. London: Williams & Norgate, 1889. Pp. xii., 68, plates and transliterations, 4to, $21.

Hughes, H. P. The Philanthropy of God, described and illustrated in a series of sermons. London: Hodder. Pp. 312, post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Inglis, J., Rev. Bible Illustrations from the New Hebrides, with Notices of the Progress of the Mission. London: Nelson. Pp. 368, 8vo, 5s.

Jaccard, E. L'église française de Zurich. Une page de l'histoire du grand refuge. Zurich: Höhr, 1889. Pp. 425, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Joubert. Histoire de l'église réformé de Laval au xviie siècle, d'après des documents inédits (1600–1686). Paris: Lechevalier.

Kaminka. Studien zur Geschichte Galiläas. Berlin: Engel, 1889. 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Kirn, O., Dr. Ueber Wesen und Begründung der religiösen Gewissheit. Antrittsvorlesung. Basel: Detloff, 1890. Pp. 28, 8vo, 1 mk.

Klein, M. Lotze's Lehre vom Sein und Geschehen in ihrem Verhältnis zur Lehre Herbart's. Berlin: Breitkreuz. Pp. 93, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

König, Arthur, Prof. Der katholische Priester vor 1500 Jahren. Priester und Priesterthum nach der Darstellung des heiligen Hieronymus. Breslau: Aderholz, 1890. Pp. viii., 201, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Kötzschke, K. R. Ruprecht von der Pfalz und das Konzil zu Pisa. Inaugural-Dissertation, Jena. Leipzig: Fock, 1889. Pp. 114, 8vo, 2 mk.

Kronenberg, A. J. Minuciana sive annotationes criticae in Minucii Felicis Octavium. Specimen litterarium inaugurale. Leiden: V. Doesburgh. Pp. v., 90, 8vo, 2 mk.

Kuenen, A. Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan en de Verzameling van de Boeken des ouden Verbonds. Tweede Deel: De profetische Boeken. Leiden: Engels en Zoon. 8vo, 5 85 fl.

Langer, J. Das Buch Job in neuer und treuer Uebersetzung nach der Vulgata. 3. Aufl. Das Hohelied nach seiner mystischen Erklärung. Eine Paraphrase. 2. Aufl. Freiburg i. B.: Herder. Pp. xx., 219; ix., 86, 8vo, 3 mk.

Lelièvre, M. Les jeunes martyrs huguenots au xvie siècle. Paris: Buttner-Thierry, 1889. Pp. 24, avec grav., 12mo.

Liberté religieuse en Russie. Rapport présénte aux branches de l'alliance évangélique par le Comité de Genève sur les démarches faites auprès de S. M. l'Empereur de Russie relativement à la liberté religieuse dans l'Empire russe et les provinces baltiques de 1887 à 1889. Genève: George, 1889. Pp. 71, 8vo, 1 fr.

Linder, Glieb. Simon Sulzer und sein Antheil an der Reformation im Lande Baden, sowie an den Unionsbestrebungen. Heidelberg: Winter, 1890. Pp. iv., 170, 8vo, 3 mk.

Lockhart, W. The Church of Scotland in the Thirteenth Century: the Life and Times of David de Bernham of St. Andrews (Bishop), 1239–1253. London: Blackwoods, 1889. 6s.

Lods, A. L'église réformée de Paris de la révocation à la Révolution (1685–1789). Paris: Fischbacher, 1889. Pp. 16, 8vo.

Loofs, Fried., Prof. Leitfaden für seine Vorlesungen über Dogmengeschichte. Halle: Niemeyer, 1889. Pp. xii., 303, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Luthardt, C. F. History of Christian Ethics before the Reformation. Translated from the German by W. Hastie. Edinburgh: Clark, 1889. Pp. 420, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Luther und **Emser.** Ihre Streitschriften aus dem Jahre 1521, hrsg. von Enders. 1. Bd. Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1889. 8vo, 1.20 mk.

McCosh, James, D.D., LL.D. Religious Aspects of Evolution. New, enlarged edit. New York: Scribner. 12mo, $1.00.

Macduff, J. R., D.D. Gloria Patri. A book of private prayers for morning and evening. New York: Nelson, 1890. Pp. 287, 16mo, $1.

MacQueary, Howard, Rev. Evolution of Man and Christianity. New York: Appleton. 12mo, cloth, $1.75.

Maisch, G., Prof. Von Nazareth zum Oelberg. Das Leben unsers Herrn Jesu Christi. In Worten der Erzählung, Andacht und Poesie nach den vier Evangelien für das evangelische Volk geschildert. Illustrirt von Rud. Yelin. Lieferung 5–12. Stuttgart: Ochs. Pp. 217-736, 8vo, 50 pf. per Lieferung.

Malan, S. C., Rev. Original Notes on the Book of Proverbs according to the Authorized Version. Vol. 1, ch. i.-ix. London: Williams & Norgate. Pp. 490, 8vo, 12s.

Margerie, A. de. Le Comte Joseph de Maistre: sa vie, ses écrits, ses doctrines, avec des documents inédits. Paris: Tardieu, 1889. Pp. xxii., 443, 8vo.

Miodonski, Adam, Dr. Anonymus adversus Aleatores (gegen das Hazardspiel) und die Briefe au Cyprian, Lucian, Celerinus, und an den karthagin. Klerus. . . . Kritisch verbessert, erläutert und ins Deutsche übersetzt. Mit einem Vorworte von Professor Ed. Wölfflin. Leipzig: Deichert, 1889. Pp. 128, 8vo, 2 mk.

Molines, L. De philosophico reformatorum principio (Thèse). Montpellier: Boehm, 1889. Pp. 138, 8vo.

Montefiore, Arthur. David Livingstone: His Labors and his Legacy. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 160, 12mo, 75 cts.

Monumenta Germaniæ historica inde ab anno Christi D. usque ad MD. . . . Necrologia Germaniæ, II., Pars I: Diœcesis Salisburgensis, edidit. Sig. Herzberg-Frankel. Berlin: Weidmann. Pp. iv., 283, 4to, 1 Tafel, 9 mk.

Moorsom, R. M. A Historical Companion to Hymns Ancient and Modern. Containing the Greek and Latin, the German, Italian, French, Danish and Welsh Hymns, the first lines of the English Hymns, the names of all authors and translators, notes and dates. London: Parker, 1889. Pp. 406, 18mo, 5s.

Müller, Gust. Ad. Christus bei Josephus Flavius. Eine kritische Untersuchung als Beitrag zur Lösung der berühmten Frage und zur Erforschung der Urgeschichte des Christenthums. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1890. Pp. 153, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Newton, William Wilberforce. William Augustus Mühlenberg. (American Religious Leaders, vol. 3.) Boston and New York: Houghton & Mifflin, 16mo, cloth, $1.25.

Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society. The Letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, about the Holy Places (386 A.D.). Translated by A. Stewart and annotated by C. W. Wilson. London, 1889. Pp. viii., 16, 8vo.

Palmer, B. M., D D. Formation of Character. Twelve lectures delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, New Orleans, La. New Orleans: Upton [1890]. Pp. 222, 16mo, $1.00.

Pascalein, E. Origine du pape Innocent V. (Pierre de Tarentaise). Annecy: Abry, 1889. Pp. 24, 8vo.

Pastor, L., Prof. Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Bd. 2: Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance bis zum Tode Sixtus IV. Freiburg i. B.: Herder. Pp. xlvii., 687+38, 8vo, 10 mk.

Perren, C., Rev., Ph.D. Seed Corn for the Sower; or, Thoughts, Themes, and Illustrations for the Pulpit and Platform and for Home Readings. Original and selected. New York and Chicago: Revell (1889). Pp. 422, 12mo, $1.50.

Perring, Philip, Sir. The Works and Days of Moses; or, a Critical Dissertation on the First Two Chapters of Genesis. New York: Longmans & Green, 1890. Pp. 136, 12mo, $1.25.

Pestalozzi, J. Was hat das deutsche Volk vom Evangelischen Bunde zu hoffen, zu befürchten und zu fördern? Eine Betrachtung im Rückblick auf die 3. Generalversammlung d. Evang. Bundes zu Eisenach. Bonn: Schergens. Pp. 40, 8vo, 60 pf.

Pictorial Africa: Its Heroes, Missionaries and Martyrs. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 400, 8vo, illustrated, $2.50.

Pierling. Papes et Tsars (1547–1597), d'après des documents nouveaux. Paris: Libr. Retaux-Bray, 1889. Pp. 519, 8vo.

Pierson, Arthur T., Editor. The One Gospel; or, The Combination of the Narratives of the Four Evangelists in One Complete Record. New York: Baker & Taylor Co. [1890]. Pp. ii., 203, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.; limp morocco, $2.

Pitchford, J. W. Beata Spes: Some Reasons for the Blessed Hope of Everlasting Life. London: Nisbet. Pp. 356, post 8vo, 6s.

Rate, J. Some Leaves from the Tree of Life: Discourses, Consolatory and Practical. London: Hodder. Pp. 328, post 8vo, 6s.

Records of the Past. Edited by A. H. Sayce. New Series. Vols. 1–2. Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d.

Reuter, Heinr. Das Subdiakonat, dessen historische Entwicklung und liturgisch-kanonistische Bedeutung. Augsburg: Huttler. Pp. v., 304, 8vo, 4 mk.

Riehm, Ed., Prof. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Dr. Alexander Brandt. Lieferung 2–6. Halle: Strien, 1889. Pp. 81–480, 8vo.

Ritschl, Albr. Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. 1. Bd.: Die Geschichte der Lehre. 3. Aufl. Bonn: Marcus, 1889. Pp. viii., 656, 8vo, 10 mk.

Robidou, Bertrand. Histoire du clergé pendant la révolution française. Tome II. Paris: Lévy. 7.50 fr.

Row, C. A. Christian Theism: A Brief and Popular Survey of the Evidence upon which it Rests and the Objections Urged against it Considered and Refuted. London: Hodder. Pp. 316, post 8vo, 5s.

Rowe, G. Stringer. Alone with the Word: Devotional Notes on the whole of the New Testament. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 424, 8vo, cloth, $2.25.

Salmon, George, D.D. Historical Introduction to the Books of the New Testament. 4th edition. London: Murray, crown 8vo, 9s.

Schaefer, Aloys, Prof. Die Bücher des N. T., erklärt. 1. Bd.: Erklärung der 2 Briefe an die Thessalonicher und des Briefes an die Galater. Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1890. Pp. viii., 361, 8vo, 5.50 mk.

Schneider, C. M. Das apostolische Jahrhundert, als Grundlage der Dogmengeschichte dargestellt. Bd. II., Abth. 1. Regensburg: Verlags-Anstalt, 1890. Pp. 208, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Schultze, A. (President Moravian Theological Seminary). The Books of the Bible briefly Analyzed, for Use in Bible Instruction and for Bible Students in General. 2d edition, revised and corrected. Easton, Pa.: Frueauff, 1890. Pp. 40, 12mo, paper, 20 cts.

Simson. Der Begriff der Seele bei Plato. Eine Studie. Leipzig: Duncker. 8vo, 4.20 mk.

Smith, R. Reunion among Christians: A Plea for its Speedy Accomplishment. London: Cassell. 8vo, sewed, 6d.

Soden, H. v. Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Philipper. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr, 1889. Pp. vii., 98, 8vo, 1 mk.

Spicker, Gideon. Spencer's Ansicht über das Verhältniss der Religion zur Wissenschaft. Münster: Coppenrath. Pp. 42, 4to, 80 pf.

Spurgeon, Charles H. Around the Wicket Gate: or, A Friendly Talk with Seekers concerning Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. New York: American Tract Society [1890]. Pp. 104, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Stapfer, Edmond, D.D. Palestine in the Time of Christ. Translated by Annie H. Holmden. 3d edition, with maps and plans. New York: Armstrong [1890]. Pp. xii., 527, post 8vo, $2.50.

Strack, Herm. L. Der Mischnatraktat "Sabbath" herausgegeben und erklärt. (Schr. d. Inst. Jud. in Berlin, No. 7.) Leipzig: Hinrichs. Pp. 78, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Stubbs, J. W. The History of the University of Dublin from its Foundation to the End of the Eighteenth Century. With an appendix of original documents, which for the most part are preserved in the college. Dublin: Hodges; London: Longmans. Pp. 438, 8vo, 12s. 6d.

Taylor, Isaac. The Origin of the Aryans: An Account of the Prehistoric Ethnology and Civilization of Europe. (Contemporary Science Series.) London: W. Scott. Pp. 350, illustrated, post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Tertullian's Apology for the Christians. Translated, with introduction, analysis, and appendix containing the letters of Pliny and Trajan respecting the Christians, by T. Herbert Bindley. London: Parker. Pp. 176, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Theologische Jahresbericht. Unter Mitwirkung von Benrath, Böhringer, Dreyer, etc., herausgegeben von R. A. Lipsius. 8. Bd., enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1888. Abth. 1–4. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr. 8vo, 24 mk.

Thieme, Carolus. De normis bonorum operum quid existimaverit Melanthon tempore Confessionis Augustanae eiusque Apologiae. Commentatio historica et ethica. Leipzig: Ackermann, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo, paper.

Thomas. Les temps primitifs et les origines religieuses d'après la Bible et la science. 2 vols. Paris: Blond et Barral, 1889. Pp. xvii., 330, 364, 8vo.

Vigouroux, F. Le Nouveau Testament et les découvertes archéologiques modernes. Avec des illustrations d'après les monuments. Paris: Berche et Tralin, 1889. Pp. viii., 438.

Vince, C. A. Christian Conduct: Sermons Preached in the Chapel of Mill Hill School. London: Hodder. Pp. 222, post 8vo, 5s.

Vrba, Carl Fr., Dr. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Augustinischen Textkritik. Wien: Tempsky. Pp. 80, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

Vulliet, A. La glorieuse rentrée des Vaudois du Piémont dans leurs vallées en 1689. Avec 1 gravure. Lausanne: Bridel, 1889. Pp. 56, 12mo.

Wildeboer, G., Dr. (Professor Groningen). Het ontstaan van den Kanon des Ouden Verbonds. Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek. Groningen: Wolters.

Williams, Monier, Sir. Buddhism: Its Connection with Brahmanism and Hinduism, and its Contrast with Christianity. 2d edition. London: Murray. 8vo, index and 21 illustrations, 21s.

Witte, L. Gegen römisch-katholische Wiedertaufe. (Flugschriften des Evangelischen Bundes.) Leipzig: Braun, 1890. Pp. 29, 8vo, 15 pf.

Wollny, F. Der Atheismus als Heilswahrheit. Leipzig: Wigand, 1890. Pp. 25, 8vo, 50 pf.

NOTES AND MAGAZINES.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT PERIODICALS.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW. Vol. XII., No. 45, January, 1890.
A Restatement in Theology, Rev. Henry E. Robins, D.D.; Our Academies, Rev. E. T. Tomlinson, Ph.D.; The Biblical View of Election, Rev. G. H. Elgin, D.D.; Emerson, Prof. J. C. Long, LL.D.; Missionary Training Schools—Do Baptists Need Them? A Discussion; Editorial Department; Homiletic Department; Review of Current Literature.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. Vol. XLVII., No. 185, January, 1890.
The Coming American Philosophy, Rev. Nathan E. Wood, D.D.; Dr. Cochran and Other Recent Writers on the

Atonement (No. II.), Rev. George F. Magoun, D.D. ; The Book of Job : A Lecture by Rev. Prof. W. G. Ballentine ; 1 Cor. xv. 20-28, Prof. A. C. Kendrick, D.D., LL.D. ; Later Phases of the Anglo-Catholic Movement, Rev. James W. White ; Wright's "Ice Age in North America, and its Bearing on the Antiquity of Man," Prof. Charles H. Hitchcock ; The Use of Motives in Preaching, Prof. E. I. Bosworth ; Dr. Briggs's Whither ? Prof. G. F. Wright ; Critical Notes ; Notices of Recent Publications.

Lutheran Quarterly. Vol. XX., No. 1, January, 1890.
Emotional Methods in Religion, Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph.D. ; The Temptation of Christ and his Impeccability, Rev. J. Hawkins, D.D. ; The Relation of Baptized Children to the Church, Rev. Mark S. Cressman, A.M. ; Le Conte's Book on Evolution as Related to Religious Thought, Rev. E. H. Welk, Jr. ; Without Temptation, Prof. H. M. Richards, D.D. ; The Sunday Newspaper, Rev. P. C. Croll ; Beneficiary Education, Rev. S. J. Taylor ; The Liturgical Question, Prof. J. W. Richard, D.D. ; Review of Recent Literature.

Presbyterian Quarterly. Vol. IV., No. 1, January, 1890.
The Latest Infidelity, Robert L. Dabney, D.D., LL.D. ; The General Doctrine of Inspiration, H. C. Alexander, D.D. ; The Famous Six Days, D. E. Frierson, D.D. ; Voluntary and Missionary Societies, R. L. Beal ; The Tithe System, Robert A. Webb ; Notes ; Criticisms and Reviews ; Notices of Recent Publications.

Reformed Quarterly Review. Vol. XII., No. 1, January, 1890.
An Introduction to the Study of Ethics—Humanity as General and Individual, Prof Thomas G. Apple, D.D. ; "I Believe in God the Father Almighty," the late Rev. S. H. Giesy, D.D. ; Thnetopsychitæ ; or, Against the Sleep of the Soul, Rev. J. B. Rust ; The Doctrinal Confessions—their Wane, Rev. J. C. Bowman ; Church Authority, Church Government, Rev. A. B. Koplin, D.D. ; Emerson, Charles H. Lerch ; Lay Element in Missions, S. M. Zwemer ; Simon Barjona—the Stone and the Rock ; Notices of New Books.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken. II., 1890.
Der Ursprung der Religion, Julius Köstlin ; Die praktische Theologie in der Alten Kirche, Prof. H. Jacoby (Königsberg); Unbekannte handschr. Predigten Luthers auf der Hamburger Stadtbibliothek, Lic. Dr. Buchwald ; Die Markus-und Matthäusfrage und gewisse Missverständnisse bei den Synoptikern, Prof. J. N. Sepp ; Rezensionen ; Miscellen.

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte. XI., 2. December 14, 1889.
Antonius von Padua, Ed. Lempp ; Ueber die Bedeutung der Verträge von Kadan und Wien (1534-1535) für die deutschen Protestanten, Otto Winckelmann ; Hamman von Holzhausen, Arthur Kleinschmidt ; Die Stellung der deutschen Nation des Baseler Konzils zu der Ausschreibung eines Zehnten, durch welchen die zur Griechenunion nothwendigen Geldmittel beschafft werden sollten, Dr. Wilhelm Altmann ; Zur Korrespondenz Martin Luther's, Prof. Paul Tschackert ; Die Religionsmandate des Markgrafen Philipp von Baden, 1522-1533, Richard Fester ; Schreiben Lindeman's an Kurfürst August zu Sachsen Flacius betreffend (1567), Th. Distel.

Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie. XXXIII., 1.
Der Gnosticismus, A. Hilgenfeld ; Die Verwandtenmorde Constantin's des Grossen, Prof. Otto Seeck (Greifswald) ; Zu Phoebadius von Agennum, Dr. Johan. Dräseke ; Die Verfassung der christlichen Urgemeinde in Palästina, A. Hilgenfeld ; Anzeigen.

American Catholic Quarterly Review. Vol. XV., No. 57, January, 1890.
I. True Reform in the Teaching of the Old Testament, Rev. Anthony J. Maas ; II. The Tradition of the Gentiles, M. M. Snell ; III. Russian Orthodoxy and Russian Sects, "Zemliak" ; IV. The Avesta and its Discoverer, A. Halliard Atteridge ; V. The New Crusade of the Nineteenth Century, R. H. Clarke, LL.D. ; VI. The First Period of the Anti-Irish British Diplomacy at Rome, Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, D.D. ; VII. Magna Charta as it is, D. A. O'Sullivan, Q.C. ; VIII. The Higher and Lower Education of the American Priesthood, Rev. James F. Loughlin, D.D.; IX. Forty Years in the American Wilderness, M. A. C. ; X. Our Recent American Catholic Congress and its Significance, John A. Mooney ; XI. Scientific Chronicle, Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan ; XII. Book Notices.

The article on Döllinger in this number is by Canon Liddon.

The Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D., has kindly offered to supply to those readers of the Magazine of Christian Literature who are ministers, theological students or Sunday-school teachers, the subscription edition of his valuable *Handbook of the English Versions of the Bible* at the unprecedentedly low price of *One Dollar* a copy, the original price being $2.50. The *Handbook* first appeared in 1883 and was heartily praised by competent judges. Orders are to be addressed *not* to the office of this Magazine, but *directly* to Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D., Paterson, N. J. The amount should accompany the order. The volume will be sent by express at the subscriber's charge ; or, if 16 cents be sent for postage it will go by mail.

Harper's for March contains nothing of special interest to theologians, although, as usual, much that the public in general will care about. The two archæological articles, "The Winged Victory of Samothrace," by Theodore Child, and Dr. Charles Waldstein's "The Restored Head of Iris in the Parthenon Frieze," and Mrs. Anne Thackeray Ritchie's essay on John Ruskin, may be singled out for especial praise. The poetry of the number is pleasing, and Mr. Howells begins in it a new novel—"The Shadow of a Dream."

The Century for March presents another instalment of Professor Fisher's "Nature and Method of Revelation." "Gloucester Cathedral" is the subject of an illustrated article by Mrs. Schuyler van Rensselaer. Mr. Edward L. Wilson gives us another article on biblical topography, "Some Wayside Places in Palestine." Besides these there are Lieutenant Schwatka's "Sun-dance of the Sioux ;" John La Farge's "From Tokio to Nikko," and Professor Putnam's "Prehistoric Remains in the Ohio Valley," and numerous other articles of divergent subject and interest. Mr. Joseph Jefferson's "Autobiography" is continued.

The Missionary Review of the World for March is a well-filled number. Dr. Pierson continues the account of his missionary meetings in Scotland, which have been apparently successful. His enthusiasm is very marked. He has "A Plea for Enthusiasm in Missions," in this number. Rev. Lewis Grout contributes an article upon "The Boers and Missions." These Dutch farmers have long opposed all attempts in the direction of evangelization, but now they themselves are experiencing the work of the Spirit, and in consequence are ready to aid the work among their heathen servants and dependents. Rev. D. L. Leonard writes on the interesting, but strangely neglected topic of "Moravian Missions among the American Indians." It is sad to reflect that "in every case the obstacles were overwhelming, and the tribes have well-nigh vanished from the earth." But the story stirs the blood and will incite some to renewed consecration in missionary work. Rev. Dr. Gracey writes on the "Jew in the Nineteenth Century." "Among multitudes of them in Germany the hope of a Messiah has totally disappeared." "Of the seventy thousand Jews in New York City, not over twenty-five hundred are attached to the synagogue." Evangelical work among this strange people is being prosecuted with vigor. Rev. Dr. Ellinwood has a timely article on "The Roman Catholic Lay Congress of 1889." Its spirit is excellent, and it is difficult to see how even the most ardent Romanist could take offence at its kindly, calm and sober statements. Very different from the ordinary rant on either side are the closing paragraphs. The other departments are filled as usual.

Scribner's for March has a striking article on Hypnotism, by Professor William James, of Harvard, under the title "The Hidden Self." He believes that in trances facts are revealed to the subjects which altogether transcend their possible normal consciousness. The boomerang, that wonderful Australian weapon, is minutely described by Mr. Horace Baker. Mr. Benjamin Ellis Martin in his paper "In the Footprints of Charles Lamb," corrects a number of errors which have crept into accepted biographies of Lamb There is a paper on John Ericsson which needs only mention to insure eager reading.

The complete story in the Cosmopolitan for March is by H. H. Boyesen and bears the ominous title of "A Candidate for Divorce." Mr. Frank G. Carpenter's graphic and illustrated account of "Easter in Jerusalem" is heartily commended, as is also Colonel Charles Chaillé-Long's "The Desert." Mr. Hale in the "Library" has a cheering word about the progress of temperance, in its true sense, in England. Mr. William H. Gilder's "Signal Codes, Savage and Scientific," is very interesting.

Lippincott's for March contains the third part of the interesting fragment of Nathaniel Hawthorne's "Elixir of Life," edited by Mr. Julian Hawthorne, who thus permits us to see the great novelist at work. Mr. William McGeorge's "Western Mortgages" will strike a responsive chord through the country. Rev. Frederic M. Bird's review of a new edition of "The Thoughts of Marcus Aurelius" merits attention. The complete novel of the number is given by Captain Charles King—"Two Soldiers."

The article in the Atlantic Monthly for March which will most interest those who are on the search for serious matter is that on Giordano Bruno by Mr. William R. Thayer. Our readers will recollect the excellent article on Bruno which appeared in our November number. Mr. Thayer waxes very enthusiastic over Bruno and quotes with approval Mr. Symond's dictum that Bruno's "dream was so golden, so divine, that it was worth the pangs of martyrdom. Can we say the same for Hegel's system, or for Schopenhauer's, or for the encyclopædic ingenuity of Herbert Spencer ?" Oliver Wendell Holmes is particularly amusing in "Over the Tea-cups," and writes some droll remarks on verse-making. An unsigned article, "Loitering through the Paris Exposition," contains some capital word-pictures of show-life.

BR
1
C635
v.1

Christian literature

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
